Kelly Locke, (Chair), Theresa Carbajal, LaVerne Cook, Mary Cousineau, Mercedes Del Real, Mary Dominguez, Gabby Lopez, Jamie Pedroza, Celine Pinet, Deborah Stephens, Violeta Wenger, Ann Wright

: Herbert Cortez

Cheryl O'Donnell, Kathy Mendelsohn, Mary Johnson, James Beck, Sonia Arteaga, Bronwyn Moreno

: Hartnell College will be nationally recognized for the success of our students by developing leaders who will contribute to the social, cultural, and economic vitality of our region and the global community.

: Focusing on the needs of the Salinas Valley, Hartnell College provides educational opportunities for students to reach academic goals in an environment committed to student learning, achievement and success.

EGN12 Engineering Design with SolidWorks was deleted in the consent agenda after

*MOI, methods of instruction; MOE, methods of evaluation;

1. Form Joint Subcommittee for SLO approval process—select members, refer to SLO committee to select joint members.
   Instead of taking this action the committee had a discussion about how SLOs fit into the curriculum approval process. SLOs are in CurricUNET and must be reviewed/revised by the discipline faculty when a course comes through the curriculum approval process. Current practice is that the SLO liaison reviews SLOs and works with discipline faculty as needed. Curriculum Chair also reviews SLOs prior to course approval. Committee members expressed concern that there is already so much to review in the COR that adding SLO approval to general committee might not be a good idea.

   Another issue is that course approval has a longer time lag than SLO approval. For example, course revisions approved this semester won't go into effect until Spring 2018, but faculty would want SLO revisions to go into effect sooner. Course revisions are constrained by CCCCO approval and local scheduling and information management systems. SLO revisions are only constrained by timeline for creating syllabi for upcoming semester.

   There was discussion about the role of the SLO committee and the need for the Curriculum Committee members to understand that role better.

   Chair will schedule a meeting between members of the two committees.

2. Remove option for inactivation of courses. Two categories of courses, active and deleted (called inactive by CCCCO). Implication: requires two readings to bring course back as a new course.

   There was discussion about the meaning of inactive in the context of ASSIST and others. Inactive means the course hasn't been offered in two years. This is not a Curriculum Committee action, but occurs automatically. There was a suggestion that for curriculum process we have the two categories "Active" and "Historical." Calling a course deleted implies that all record of it is gone and that is not the case. "Historical" might be a more accurate description.

   There was a request to get a list of all courses that haven't been offered in the last two years, and the list of all courses that haven't been offered in the last three years. More thought about this change and possible impact is required.

   1. Survey results for professional development
      Standards and Criteria for course approval was the top item listed as a priority in the survey. A presentation will be scheduled using local talent. Prerequisites and Non-credit were also high on the list of items for professional development. Chair will pursue experts from the CCC system to provide training on these topics.
   2. Future meeting items: The Program and Course Approval Handbook, 6th ed. is due out in March. It would be a good meeting topic.

      The curriculum timelines need to be updated to reflect deadlines for next academic year.