

August 27, 2015 (2:15 p.m.)

MINUTES

<u>Members Present</u> Chair Business/Technology Creative Arts/Social Science Division Language Arts Division Math/Science Division Student Services

Teresa Morris Melissa Green Jeremy Ball, Nico van Dongen Amy Sobel, Anne Stafford Christopher Walker Martin Bednarek, Mary Valenti

Absent/Excused ASCSM Kinesiology Division Library Math/Science Division

Non-Voting Members

N/A Shana Young Kalina Tabatt Chris Smith

Sandra Comerford, Ada Delaplaine, Marsha Ramezane, Niruba Srinivasan

Other Attendees

N/A

Chair, Teresa Morris called the meeting to order at 2:21 p.m.

Open Agenda

Welcome and introductions

All the committee members introduced themselves and the new members were welcomed to the committee.

Curricular process overview/CurricUNET updates

Curriculum Handbook – the handbook is now posted on the Committee on Instruction website under Course Submission Instructions, below is the

link. <u>http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/committeeoninstruction/docs/CSMCurriculumHandbook-</u> <u>Fall2015.pdf</u>. It can be downloaded and printed out if needed.

The Chair expressed the desire to have the division representatives' role include helping division faculty with creating and modifying curriculum as well as reporting back to their divisions Committee on Instruction information.

Within the handbook, on pages 11-14, is a worksheet of typical technical review comments. The Chair went on to explain how to review proposals and where the common errors occur. A sample new course was reviewed by utilizing the courses' All Fields Report.

>A question was asked regarding the description. It was explained that at CSM we only use the catalog description; the schedule description is no longer used. Currently, the handbook advised to use the same description in both fields. However, CurricUNET will be contacted to see if the schedule description field can be hidden (for CSM only) to avoid confusion.

>The unit/hours chart and repeatability were reviewed. Most courses are no longer repeatable, only a few exceptions are repeatable, such as intercollegiate athletics.
>The SLOs and Objectives areas were discussed. These areas should be entered individually and not as one entry. Additional discussion regarding similarity between SLOs and Objectives followed.

>If a prerequisite is required, then the content review must be completed.

>Textbooks are required as part of the outline, they can be textbooks or department handbooks and they must be current books. It however, is not a requirement for the faculty to use the textbooks that are listed; they are only representative texts.

>The Degree Applicability area is where a course can be proposed for a particular GE Area and/or for a particular degree or certificate. Degree applicability may also have an impact on financial aid.

>A typical omission is the Representative Assignments area. The writing and reading assignments should be completed.

>If a course was previously approved or if a new course is seeking approval to be offered in the distance education mode, then the Distance Ed and DE Contact sections must be completed.

>The Resources Needed area should also be addressed.

>The codes can be entered and if assistance is necessary, Ada in the Instruction Office may be contacted.

>The sample course showed the number of hours each topic might take to discuss. However, this is not typically done. Essentially the content area is a contract with the students. So if the submitter wants to list hours, then an opening sentence should be added explaining that the hours listed are only an estimation or approximation of the time allotted to each topic.

>If questions arise regarding the FLCs, the chair suggested working with the division dean.

Another sample, this time of a course modification was reviewed. The Course Comparison Report can be viewed to see the changes that are being proposed. The Chair stressed that the complete proposal should still be reviewed to ensure the outline is as "clean" as possible. One area to check is the DE area to make sure the supplement has been fully completed.

Important issues for the year

Review of 2013-14 goals and proposed 2015-2016 goals.

The Chair provided the list of proposed goals for 2015-16 and asked committee members to be prepared to vote on the goals at the next meeting.

• Proposed 2015-16:

Goal: Review and approve new and modified courses and programs (ongoing) Benchmark: Number reviewed and outcome

Goal: With Distance Education Committee (newly reconstituted), review standards and approval processes.

Benchmark: Review form available, approval process developed and approved.

Goal: Review General Education pattern for possible revision Benchmark: Open forums concerning GE requirements, COI and ASGC approvals for revisions to GE pattern.

Discussion followed after counselors were asked their opinion on this topic. It was mentioned that following the CSU GE pattern would make things easier to avoid hurdles for students until a program such as cosmetology is being viewed where there are no similar CSU programs.

• Area of Emphasis (AoE) Degrees

Transfer Model Degrees were discussed. The C-ID website was displayed showing our current TMC degrees. The language of the law that dictated the TMCs, also stated that other "interdisciplinary" programs with Areas of Emphasis should also be created. Currently, there are two programs, Global Studies and Social Justice Studies that have been vetted. Although at CSM we do not have a Social Justice degree, we may have similar core courses that can be matched to the AoE. It would become the basis for a new degree that would have and AoE in Social Justice. However, we do not have to submit an AOE in this area. We also do not have a Global Studies degree, so again this is not necessary to pursue. Ultimately, this is something that would need to be discussed with the faculty and the interdisciplinary issue is something to keep in mind in terms of were the program would be housed and how it gets assessed, among other issues.

Meeting adjourned at 3:33.