

Higher Education Coordinating Commission

Math Common Course Numbering Subcommittee

Meeting

Nikki Gavin (Co-chair)
Celeste Petersen (Co-chair)
Peter Haberman
Vicki Maurer
Pam Morse
Rick Rieman
~~Doug Gardner~~
Allison Williams
Steve Tanner
Randall Paul
Sara Clark
Mike Price
Beatriz Lafferriere
~~Curtis Feist~~
Leanne Merrell
~~Elizabeth Jones~~

MATH MINUTES
October 27, 2022
8:00-10:00 am

HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING COMMISSION
3225 25TH ST Salem, OR 97302
VIDEO CONFERENCE ONLY

AGENDA
<p>Welcome Role was called and a quorum was established. Meeting started at 8:02</p>
<p>Approval of Minutes from October 21, 2022 Vote to approve: Steve Tanner Second: Rick Rieman Vote: 13 No: 0 Abstain: 0 Passing unanimously</p>
<p>Old Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Celeste reviewed the questions and answers: <p>Question 1: Is there a requirement for the class format (4 credits lecture versus three lecture and one lecture/Lab) We are establishing the number of credits for the courses but would like to leave the decision of whether they are lecture or lecture/lab credits up to individual schools as this directly affects seat time and teaching styles. Is this acceptable?</p> <p>Response to Question 1: Per the framework, the total credit hours must match. Contact hours may differ, allowing for flexibility among institutions.</p> <p>Question 2: When we number courses in a series, would you prefer a numeric or alpha signifier? When looking at classes in a series like Calc. 1, Calc. , Cal 3, or PreCalc. I and Precalc. II would you prefer an alpha notation like Calculus A, Calculus B, Calculus C; a numeric indication like Pre-Calculus 1 and Pre-Calculus 2; or a Roman Numeral notation like Fundamentals of Elementary Mathematics I, Fundamentals of Elementary Mathematics II, and Fundamentals of Elementary Mathematics III?</p> <p>Response to Question 2: Do not use alpha designators in the title; either Roman or Arabic numerals are acceptable, allowing for flexibility among institutions.</p>

Question 3: If we approve course Outcomes that include headings, would removing the headers be considered a stylistic change? We want to clarify, if we approve something like the one shown below, would colleges be able to remove the bolded headings as a stylistic change?

Course Outcomes:

- 1. Mathematical Reasoning:** Students will read complex problems requiring quantitative and/or symbolic analysis, use flexibility in selecting solution strategies, and impose appropriate mathematical structures or mathematical procedures in solving problems in the contexts of logical reasoning, probability, data, statistics, and financial mathematics.
- 2. Mathematical Habits of Thought:** Students will determine the reasonableness and implications of mathematical solutions and approximations, and will recognize the limitations of the methods used in context.

Response to Question 3:

Institutions may consider headers to be stylistic elements; however, if the header information is critical to the meaning of the outcome, then it should be included in the body of the outcome.

Question 4: (sent after original memo sent: Is it possible to word the course description in a way that allows additional topics to be listed in the description? Something like, " May contain up to 25% additional content including (fill in specific topics for your school here)," as the last line of the course description?

Response to Question 4:

The inclusion of additional content in a course description (up to 25% only) is meant to allow for institutions to reflect outcomes that an individual institution may consider necessary to address content that is specific to that institution. No additional wording is needed at the subcommittee level.

There was continued discussion of [MTH 111 and MTH 112](#). Leanne recommended 5 credit courses for MTH 111 & 112 for consideration and discussion. There was discussion for 4 credits and 5 credits. Straw poll: 4 credit = 9 / 5 credit= 3 / on fence= 1. November 4th is the deadline for the recommendation, if this group does not make a recommendation, the Transfer Council will make the decision.

New Business

- After the discussion on MTH 111 & MTH 112, a minority report will be written. Leanne Merrill and Nikki Gavin will work on the minority report on credits. The subcommittee straw poll was for writing the report.
- Rick Rieman shared feedback letter on retaining Conic Section in the MTH 112 Curriculum. The subcommittee discussed MTH 112.
- Pam Morse shared comments from her faculty.

Recommendation Report - Draft Review

- The first draft recommendation report was reviewed and discussed. A suggested review to revisit and convene for MTH was discussed.
- MTH 105 will be brought to the meeting tomorrow for review by Nikki Gavin, she will match the language of MTH 111 & MTH 112.

Action Items

- Vote scheduled for 10/28 at 4:45 pm.
- Another share for final feedback from your faculty.

Public Comments

- Katelyn Goslin, MHCC said the co-req model isn't going to be financial aid eligible, which is an equity issue. MTH 111 & 112 is 5 credits at her school.

Next Meeting: Friday 10/28, 3-5 pm

Meeting ended at 9:50 am