Notes from Meeting with Peggy and Dawn, 28 Feb 17

Peggy, Don, Karl, and Carey met to discuss possible collaboration between AASC and APR for curriculum development/modification process improvement. The focus was to first outline pros and cons and then open up discussion on possible solutions.

The group opened up with what our current process includes. Faculty looking to develop or modify curriculum go to a variety of sources for help. These may include other faculty, academic deans, past experience, or just working though the submission forms. In all cases, the final decision is made in AASC and with mixed results for success. Some programs sail through rather easily while others may return to the AASC committee 2-3 more times before getting approval.

Some of the pros and cons concerning our process right now:
PROS:
- Faculty are very engaged in this process
- There is a distinct effort to provide help from others, both faculty and academic staff
- The dynamic forms do provide a clear data information path

CONS:
- Current process is not well known or understood by anyone outside the AASC committee
- Little housekeeping on problems, failure to provide adequate feedback when things are not right, nor is it consistent
- No defined process or format exists and desired outcomes could differ from meeting to meeting
- APR group is seldom included in the process yet has most of the needed information to develop much of the program and course work (nuts and bolts of curriculum)

Lots of very positive discussion followed with a number of ideas expressed, key notes:
- Time, time, time will always be an issue regardless of position. Faculty are loaded heavily right now and leaning on academic staff are not always popular alternatives.
- If some time were made available for select people on both committees would those reviews be accepted by the AASC group or would there be continued discussion into the details of each proposed course or program?
- Other guidance is crucial! As a minimum, faculty need something in writing that shows the right direction for new or revised curriculum. How do you write outcomes, how many are needed? What are action verbs and where are they required? What are the required credit hours? How do I map a program? What sequence should program development take? What is a DACUM or similar source document to begin development? Where are checklists to get this stuff done? How many and which documents are required for AASC? What others are required for Program Navigator? What about HLC approval. What's the difference when considering a certificate, diploma or program?
- What are the faculty, deans, CAO roles I this and at what point should each be involved?
- What role does AASC have versus APR, and how can we integrate the two in this process?

In the end, I heard a lot positive notes but also some frustration about how we can get it done. I think we agreed that getting the process on paper first in the form of the handbook and developing the mapping of courses and programs would be very helpful. So as parting action steps:

1) The deans will continue to develop and complete the curriculum handbook for use beginning in August 2017. This will get people started and give us some additional focus for future work.
2) Don is making changes to the AASC process for curriculum beginning earlier due dates that will help faculty get responses before the meeting. A lot can be fixed if it gets looked at early.
3) APR and AASC can work with the deans in this handbook development as we get further along in that area.