College of Education and Community Innovation
Curriculum Committee
Meeting Agenda 12/06/2022
1:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.

See calendar invite for the link to our Zoom meeting

Members: Nagnon Diarrassouba, Daisy Fredricks, Gabriela Gui (Chair), Leanne Kang, Mohammed Lefrid, Laila McCloud, Scott Rood, Joshua Sheffer, Melissa Villarreal

Guests: Amy Schelling (Associate Dean), Heather Walker (Office Assistant, Dean's Office), others

I. **Call to Order & Roll Call**

II. **Approval of Agenda for 12/06/2022**

III. **Old Business:**

a) **Approval of Minutes 11/15/2022 –** please review before meeting and be ready to vote

b) **Meeting on 12/20/22 – in person.**

c) **Review of Proposals associated with Program Change Request: Learning, Design, and Technology**

    1. Review of Proposals, SORs, and associated documents, as follows:

All CCC members review and provide feedback for all the **change course proposals** in the EDT program change package:

Log Number	Title

    1. **12437**   **Program Change Request: Learning, Design, and Technology**

Comments:

Scott: This has the following proposed changes to this graduate program: 1) Change of program title; 2) Creation of two emphasis area; 3) Addition of 4 new courses; 4) Change of 4 existing courses; 5) Removal of practicum/field experience course.
There is expressed uncertainty regarding enough faculty to teach in this program.

Leanne: For context, the program change request went through extensive consultation and review among members of the department (Literacy, Educational Foundations, and Technology), chair, and myself. The director of the program is in conversation with the chair in approving a visiting position to support the program change.

Melissa: Proposed changes look good; however, I do not have enough knowledge about our current Master's in Educational Technology, but it appears that we are moving in the right direction with these proposed changes.

Daisy: What is the course title for "EDT 693 or 695 (3 or 6 credits)"? This is missing in the program sequence within Change 2. Be sure to use the term "PK-12" when appropriate, and consistently (e.g., "Existing K-12 educators, as well as corporate)". Overall, a strong rationale for the changes.

Gabriela: Overall: Strong proposal.

The rationale for each change is sufficient and clear.

The Type of Request entries should align with the 5 changes specified in Prompt 1, "*Describe each change and give a rationale for each one*". There are some discrepancies - i.d."Change in Program Requirements" is not the same as Change in Title. I expected to see each item listed in "Type of Request" under "Describe the Change and Give Rationale" and was disappointed I did not.

Be consistent with the course titles. Is it *EDT 637: Human Performance Improvements* or *EDT 637: Human Performance Improvement*? Both titles appear in the proposal.

Explanations of how these changes will strengthen and improve the curriculum are clear and make sense.

Amy:
- suggest the author provide rationale for the change from ISTE to AECT standards;
- CAEP rationale could simply read that because the Ed. Tech program does not lead to a teaching credential, the program is not included in the accreditation process for the CECI education programs, and thus does not require a CAEP aligned field experience
- Suggest the author note that while 4 new courses have been added to the program, the credits for the M.Ed. have not changed- (two in core/foundations and two in instructional design emphasis)
- Suggest the author include that in current program students took an elective and now will choose from one of four program courses (this should be an added program requirement change to the proposal)

Action recommended:
Scott: Recommend that any action should be taken after we vote on the component courses.

Laila: Tabled until new and revised courses are approved.

Mohammed: The new master of education in learning, design and technology should be more appealing to current students and will attract new candidates from higher education and consulting. Similar to Laila and Scott's response, approval is pending on the proposed courses.

Leanne: Agree with the above; table until new and revised courses are approved.
Melissa: Table until new and revised courses are approved.

Daisy: Was not entirely clear on how to proceed with this; but I agree with comments above to table until new and revised courses are approved.

Gabriela: The Program Change and accompanying proposals need to be approved as a package (together).
Nagnon: The program change has been discussed within the department and with me. I found that is a very strong and clear proposal. But since we have to approve the courses first and come back to the major proposal, I propose that we table it and later come back to approve it.
Joshua: Agree with Scott and Nagon

---

2. **12443**   **Change Course: EDT 619** (originally reviewed by Nagnon and Mohammed)

Proposal: Change of title and description - this should be reflected in some of the SLOs and topics listed in the SOR so that we could see the alignment between objectives, topics, assessments. Explain all of the changes, why are they necessary, etc.
Mohammed: In order for EDT 619 to become contemporary, this request attempts to change the title and description of this course while maintaining the content the same. This is concerned with learning, design and technology, it is unclear how it will help with grant proposal writing (under Curricular Integration projects). I find the new description to be repetitive and vague. (e.g. explores contemporary issues, etc.)

Nagnon: The proposal relates changes in title and in course description. Rationale: audience has expanded beyond k-12, scope of topics has broadened around digital technologies. Alignment: objectives, topics, assessments.

SOR: The SOR is well written. However a friendly suggestion in objective 1 would be a change in the second verb and in the order: recognize would be identify. Thus, the sentence would read: Identify and describe the current and future trends in the field of learning, design and technology.
While objectives and topics are well designed, the notion of history in the field does not seem to be addressed in either.
Mohammed: course is about technology; assessment is writing a proposal for a project/grant - a little misalignment; clarify or remove.

Other Docs:

Action recommended: Return for amendment

Mohammed: Approve with amendment

Nagnon: Approve with friendly amendment in the order of verbs and verb change, addressing the aspect of history in topics and learning objectives.
Scott: wants to bring the proposal back to the committee.

3. **12442** **Change Course: EDT 634 (**originally reviewed by **Gabriela and Joshua)**

Proposal: The rationales are too generic across the 4 courses. Explicit details are needed re: specific changes. Apparently, changes in SOR were made beyond what is described in the proposal submitted. (Check!!!) The author should (based on the Syllabi of Record uploaded in the GVSU's BB site) identify and address each change in the proposal to the current SOR from the repository. Do this for all 4 course changes. The proposal needs to be re-reviewed with reference to SOR in the repository and explain the changes made in the proposed SOR.
Gabriela: Are we still using K-12 educators? I believe it is Pre-K-12 now…
Some typos: "Changes to this course were made to respond this demand". Or: "The proposed changes will broaden the scope of topics around the implementation and management of instructional systems and learning technologies by providing   providing evidence-based practices for students drawing on research in their area of interest".
Joshua: proposal should be edited to note changes in the syllabus of record including the addition/change of topics and methods of evaluation and the inclusion of the appropriate rationale, etc., for those changes

SOR:
Joshua: SOR needs to be edited as words appear twice in the objectives; I don't know what/how many changes have been made to the SOR, but other than double verbs in the objectives, it looks fine;

Gabriela: Yep, double verbs under Objectives.
Are the verbs used under Objectives rigorous enough for a 600-level course - especially examine, explain, and identify?

Other Docs:

Action recommended:
Joshua: Return for amendment to proposal as identified above

Gabriela: approve with amendment

4. **12441** **Change Course: EDT 626** (originally reviewed by Laila and Scott)

Proposal:
Scott: This is a CCP wherein the course title and course description are proposed to be changed. Rationale is to meet the new audience for this course with focus outside of educators in th K-12 setting.

Laila: Proposed changes are well articulated, However, I'm not sure what the author means by "uses of technology to support diversity and assessment". What does the author mean by diversity and how does technology support diversity?

Amy: Rationale would be strengthened by including what changes specifically and related specifically to assessment

SOR:
Scott: I'm not sure how much of the SoR has been changed? When I look up the SoR in Blackboard it is structured unlike any SoR I've seen before (my lack of ED content knowledge) and not the same as in the SoR in this CCP.

Laila: SOR needs to be edited as words appear twice in the objectives.

Other Docs:

Action recommended:

Laila: Approve

---

5. **12440**   **Change Course: EDT 621** (originally reviewed by Leanne and Joshua)

Proposal:
Leanne: Proposal to change the title and description to focus on "emerging learning technologies" versus "topics in educational tech" to better respond to an expanded audience beyond K-12 settings.
Joshua: proposal should be edited to note changes in the syllabus of record including the addition/change of objectives, topics, and methods of evaluation

SOR:
Leanne: No comments/issues.

Other Docs:
Action recommended:

Leanne: Approve
Joshua: Return for amendment-with amendment to note that changes have been made in the objectives, topics, and methods of evaluation and the inclusion of the appropriate rationale, etc., for those changes

Amy: for all of the EDT course changes, the author notes that content/topics have been added but no changes made to the SLOs or MOEs. Is this appropriate and if so, a more explicit and course specific response to rationale question 2 should be provided in each proposal.

6. 12436   **Change Course: EDT 685** (originally reviewed by Gabriela and Melissa)

Proposal:

Melissa: This proposal identifies the course, EDT 685 - Practicum/Graduate Field Experience that needs to be dropped because no program is using this course anymore. It is being replaced with a new course, EDT 636.
This proposal is clear.

Gabriela: This proposal is about dropping this course (field experiences). The rationale is sufficient and documented by correspondence between the authors and Amy Shelling.
"The proposed revised program will offer candidates a practicum experience through the new course, EDT 636: Theory into Practice in Learning, Design, and Technology. Elements of the field experience will be included in this new course".

SOR:

Melissa: SOR does not need to be reviewed because we are proposing to drop the course.

Other Docs: correspondence between the authors and Director of Accreditation

Action recommended:

Melissa: Approve

Gabriela: Approve

There are 4 New Course proposals submitted for this package that we could review for 12/06:

1. 12434   New Course: EDT 622

Proposal:

SOR:

Other documents:

Action recommended:

2. 12435   New Course: EDT 623

Proposal:

SOR:

Other documents:

Action recommended:

3. 12439   New Course: EDT 636

Proposal:

SOR:

Other documents:

Action recommended:

4. 12438   New Course: EDT 637

Proposal:

SOR:

Other documents:

Action recommended:

Process:

- Agendas are posted several days before a meeting, in our Google Folder.
- All reviewers assigned to a proposal should contribute.
- Thoroughly review all proposals assigned to you based on the CCC guidelines and documents. Follow format suggested.
- Review ALL associated documents (correspondence, supporting documents, etc.).
- Write your report directly on the SAME ONE Agenda (in Google Drive CCC Folder) for the date the proposal will be discussed.
- Enter your comments <u>by the day prior to the meeting</u>.
- Make a recommendation for each proposal (see below).
    - **Approved**;
    - **Approved with Amendment**: Chair will approve upon amendments without the need for committee to review another time
    - **Return for Amendment**: Committee will review again the amended proposal(s)
    - **Tabled**: More information is needed from the author
- Report out during our meeting.

IV. Other:

V. Adjournment   General Reminder:

**Please review and comment in writing on submitted proposals in advance of our meetings
and be ready to cast your vote if there are no further discussions.**