

**Tuesday April 7, 2017, 10:00 am. - 12 pm.**

**North Campus LRC 6104**

**Present Absent:**

Hanadi Alnawab Patrick Burke

Kate Anderson Noah Gentner

Shirantha Beddage Heather Ramey Melanie Chaparian

Paul Corey Sonia Hoy

Mary Ellen Kappler Dawn Macaulay Mojgan Rezvani Stephen Stockton Andrea Tavchar Jonathan Zeyl

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Key Points** | **Action Items (Due dates will be outlined here if**  **required)** | **Individual** |
| **1. Review Meeting Notes** | It is agreed by the committee that revisions are not required to past meeting notes. |  |  |
| **2. Review of Appendices, New Course Proposal, and New Course Outline Development Templates** | Role of Committee: Adjudications about submissions – shared understanding of course expectations.  (e.g. Liberal Studies – we have our own set of agreed upon criteria that we share)  It is agreed that the committee must acquire a standard criteria as a base for reviewing new proposals.  **Appendix Review:** |  |  |

**Next Meeting: TBA . 10 am to 12 pm. North TBA**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Key Points** | **Action Items (Due dates will be outlined here if**  **required)** | **Individual** |
|  | First the committee should review Appendices from the previous committee. This will helps the committee come to an agreement for a new or revised Appendix  The old Appendix is on the website. A modified version of the Appendix has changes proposed.  Both are reviewed by the group.   * Does not include definition of breadth categories (already established). No major changes there. * *Suggested change:* Science & Technology (different wording). * *Suggested change:* In Liberal Arts – remove “languages” as courses that could be accepted.   -Cultural Studies (Study of Society in a different language – cultural component with language) – the idea that a single course that is focused on pronunciation and production of speech is not accepted (practice or skill based – no cultural component)  The group discusses Languages.  *Points Raised:*  -Whether or not it should be included (currently in red brackets on proposed Appendix change)  -Amend to have wording in reference to culture, the wording is currently confusing – cultural studies should be added.  -Other schools that accept languages as electives? (Seneca does, others don’t)  -Different structures – languages studies at |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Key Points** | **Action Items (Due dates will be outlined here if**  **required)** | **Individual** |
|  | these institutions that do accept language courses.  Decision:  Edit the languages section – Yes (unanimous)   * Outlined some of the sources committee might use to help determine if a course is upper or lower.   -Lower: textbook & objective – fact based questions  Decision:  Reword lower level section (unanimous)   * Science courses have objective/fact based questions, but these can still qualify for upper level   Decision:  Objective/fact based questions to comprehension based questions greater reliance on comprehension  Add specialized discipline knowledge (objective/subjective split – gives idea that lower level is more memorization than actual critical analysis)  Grammar Correction: Upper Level section: Delete extra “s” | ***Action:*** Amend the wording for language (see notes Dawn made on Appendix)  ***Action:*** Lower level rewording (see Dawn’s notes)  ***Action:*** Upper Level rewording (see Dawn’s notes)  ***Action:*** Delete extra “s”  ***Action:*** Speak to ADs whether they would be willing to have that | Paul  Paul  Paul  Paul  All Committee Members |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Key Points** | **Action Items (Due dates will be outlined here if**  **required)** | **Individual** |
|  | * Analysis should be specified or “analytic writing” (remove essay writing) * Specialized discipline knowledge – more than an introductory knowledge (PEQAB) * Assume they have previously acquired research method skills and specialized discipline knowledge:   “Upper level will develop specialized discipline knowledge via….”   * + More than introductory knowledge – may contain an introduction to a field of study.   Decision: Rewording regarding knowledge/analytical thinking   * + Lower level to upper level descriptions: two columns – upper & lower – points compared under its own sections | added to courses that are breadth electives – after Course Description online  – there is a line that states that students are encouraged to take an lower level course first. Look at MyHumber to see an example. **(Due Next Meeting)**  ***Action:*** Rewording regarding knowledge transfer & analytical thinking | Paul |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Key Points** | **Action Items (Due dates will be outlined here if**  **required)** | **Individual** |
|  | (change it to tabular format) – easier to read to compare and define  Decision: Change formatting – easier to read   * Entire review by committee (in old process – committee would communicate back and forth with course developer) * Upper level will need the knowledge transfer piece, as will the Lower level courses. * Balance needs to be reflected (maybe quantify) * Analytical component exists in both Upper and Lower. Lower is not just knowledge transfer/multiple choice   Decision: wording change needed – progression type wording is more precise Requires a progression of learning to get to the next level (language currently does reflect this type of format).  Learning outcomes could be changed to reflect this. Subcommittees can have more influence in this area – “How are you progressing the students?”  Grammar correction: The majority “is”.   * Is the term “In class” really needed? Category “in class, web facilitated” – use of Blackboard – make it one category – change wording to reflect that. * Web delivery is different than Web   facilitated (web facilitated – most fall | ***Action:*** Change formatting for legibility  ***Action:*** Reword  ***Action:*** Edit grammar | Paul  Paul  Paul |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Key Points** | **Action Items (Due dates will be outlined here if**  **required)** | **Individual** |
|  | into this category)  In class supported by an online system.   * Rework these definitions – all deliveries do have a web component – online and web facilitated can be combined.   Decision: Online, Hybrid, In-Class – all have a web component – face to face that utilizes technology (minimum requirement for Blackboard usage)  Decision: Keep “Independent Studies” - all concur (unanimous)   * Appendix – reword to call it something else – “Guidelines” – “Terms, Definitions & Resources” maybe?   Decision: Change title   * Degree “Process” instead of “Guidelines”   (perhaps combine in one document) Decision: Change title   * PEQAB Guidelines: Replacing old version with new version   Decision: Replace PEQAB Guidelines   * How much responsibility on instructor to contextualize?   Discussion with committee: There is a desire to have this knowledge contextualized so students can understand | ***Action:*** Modify the definitions and the statement regarding web components (delivery types)  ***Action:*** Change title of document  ***Action:*** Change title of document  ***Action:*** Add new version of PEQAB Guidelines | Paul  Paul  Paul  Paul |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Key Points** | **Action Items (Due dates will be outlined here if**  **required)** | **Individual** |
|  | why an area is important for them as a person in their area of study.  ***Issue:*** Contextualizing and Popularity of course topic (i.e. How many students would want to take a course that is about Mathematics, etc.?)  Some schools do offer these types of courses to students, but not an open breadth, but actually a required breadth. (required – mandated breadth requirements)  **Degree Breadth New Course Form Review:**   * No new changes to this form * Change where it says Appendix * Where there is red dots submit proposal   Decision: Load new form on website  **Template for Course Review:**   * Portion about other instructors that could change the course – might want to add that somewhere * Get rid of breakdown * Does it still make sense – breakdown of Blooms textonomy (sp???) (breakdown should be there) * Links to be updated   Decision: Further review required. | ***Action:*** New Form to be loaded – changes already made | Paul |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Key Points** | **Action Items (Due dates will be outlined here if**  **required)** | **Individual** |
| **3. Committee Website Review** | Dawn briefed the committee on her discussion with Susan from Black Cat (Web Designer)   * Humber is thinking of bringing in database – to collect info from various sources – public interface that draws information from different parts of the college – perfect opportunity to use this kind of database. * It can help us receive submissions – people could submit on that website   – we could read and make recommendations   * Applications will not go further until it has approval * Planning & Development will aid in getting other areas to update when a course is approved   Dawn will meet with Gina Antonacci to find out how much it is going to cost. To find out more and if institutions is willing to support this initiative.  **Update on Website Launch:**  We will get Excel version of listing online, new documents and forms. We will find out whether this will be possible and what timelines will be (if it can be completed in May) we will use this new conduit  Dawn made the announcement at the AOC meeting in March that we will be ready with clear process guidelines and new forms in May.  At that time we can receive new proposals. Whatever version of the website we can  have ready for May, will be what we will | ***Action:*** Schedule another meeting with Black Cat  ***Action:*** Meet with Gina Antonacci | Dawn  Dawn |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Key Points** | **Action Items (Due dates will be outlined here if**  **required)** | **Individual** |
|  | roll out. We may not get any submissions until June. |  |  |
| ***Question:*** Will we have a cycle for submission. Maybe submit twice a year? ***Response:*** Liberal Studies has standing submissions (meetings in October & January). There might be one in Spring. We need to come up with a critical path( include expectations) |  |  |
| ***Course Rationale:*** Go back to each department and see what would be the Course Rationale that we would state for these courses from the different areas. | ***Action:*** Course Rationale ideas (due by next meeting – March 23) | All Members |
| Dawn clarified the process: Subcommittee works directly with the faculty member, but the final decision will be communicated to the committee as a whole. The committee will communicate with the School. |  |  |
| The committee would like to see the Excel Spreadsheet of the courses. | ***Action:*** Send Excel Sheet | Dawn |
| **4. Proposed revision of existing course (MSTU 1006)** | **MSTU 1006:**   * Course that exists – introductory section has a specific focus on Public Relations – there is a desire to continue to offer this course as a breadth course * Needs revisions to broaden the course and offer it in a hybrid form this Summer. * Course is in first year of PR program – has   to have a broader appeal for other |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Key Points** | **Action Items (Due dates will be outlined here if**  **required)** | **Individual** |
|  | programs. (Andrea Tavchar was involved in course creation)   * Part of the way this course is organized is different from the original one. Developed in line with new software for course outlines. |  |  |
| **5. Other Business** | No other business. |  |  |