

# College of San Mateo

Committee on Instruction  
August 24, 2017 (2:15 p.m.)

## MINUTES

### Members Present

Chair	Teresa Morris
Academic Support and Learning Technologies	Ron Andrade
Business/Technology	Melissa Green
Creative Arts/Social Science Division	Judith Hunt
Kinesiology Division	Shana Young
Language Arts Division	Fermin Irigoyen, David Laderman
Library	Matthew Montgomery
Math/Science Division	Chris Smith, Christopher Walker
Student Services	Martin Bednarek, Mary Valenti

### Absent/Excused

Creative Arts/Social Science Division	Nico van Dongen
ASCSM	

### Non-Voting Members

Sandra Stefani Comerford, Ada Delaplaine,  
Marsha Ramezane, Niruba Srinivasan, Alma  
Gomez

### Other Attendees

Heidi Diamond, Anniqua Rana

Chair, Teresa Morris called the meeting to order at 2:19 p.m.

***Motion was MSCU to approve the August 24, 2017 agenda.***

### **Open Agenda**

- Welcome and introductions  
Committee members introduced themselves. Sandra Stefani Comerford, Vice President of Instruction, welcomed all the members.

The Chair requested members to fill out a training needs survey. She will set up training sessions based on responses received.

- Curricular process overview
  - Curriculum certification process

The Chair advised the committee on resources that we use for curriculum approval: Title 5, PCAH, curriculum handbook, and the CSM GE handbook. Most of the links are on the COI website.

Title 5 is the legislation that governs most of what COI does. The Chair encouraged everyone to familiarize themselves with this.

There is an updated version of the Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH). This document has information on how to submit things to the State, criteria for submission, and other important regulation information. Faculty writing new courses will find useful information here.

COI is also guided by memos, e.g., from the Chancellor's Office, memo re changes in repeatability. We participate in making policies for the Board of Trustees' approval.

There was a discussion on streamlining curriculum approval. Last fall, we received a memo about getting curriculum approved locally. In the spring, the Chancellor's Office and Academic Senate had conversations to figure out new processes and workflows for streamlining. We certify that a course went through a vigorous review; all the State needs to do is chapter it/assign a control number. The following will need to sign off: the COI Chair, Vice President of Instruction, Academic Senate President, and the CEO/College President. We will get more information on October 1. Training is needed to inform people about the certification process changes. The training will help us write better curriculum.

- **Course outline changes**  
The basic information like course titles, description, grading info, etc. are the same. One of the changes is the addition of homework hours. Generally, the calculation is 2 hours of homework for every lecture hour. Previously, students might have assumed that they only needed to spend x number of hours for the class. Homework hours give faculty and students an idea of the work needed to earn the class unit. Homework hours count towards student learning hours for which we get apportionment.
- **Catalog changes**  
Last spring, there was a major clean up in CurricUNET because the new catalog was going to be electronically produced based on data from CurricUNET. One of the advantages of the electronic catalog is that items are hyperlinked. Limited copies will be printed; in general, faculty will not receive copies and will need to rely on the electronic version. It is easier to make changes in the online catalog, but changes should be identified. One suggestion was to keep a Change Log to track changes. The catalog is a useful document for checking associates degree info, transfer info, course descriptions, figuring out how your course compares to courses in other areas. We can compare courses to those in the other 2 district campuses.

- Important CSM issues for this year
  - Review of 2017-2018 goals
    - Review new and modified courses
    - Review GE pattern for possible revision
    - Review and update GE Handbook and Curricular Handbook

A member inquired if there is a consistent pattern in course reviews, e.g. issues that often come up. We might be able to eliminate having the same conversations come up repeatedly. Last year, we spent a lot of time reviewing and approving courses and there was limited time to discuss goals. The Chair shared that some schools do course reviews only in the fall. Some schools assign specific months to departments, e.g., review CIS courses in October, and if the deadline is missed, the course won't be reviewed. Some schools have more subcommittees with specific responsibilities and they report back to the committee. The Chair will review the minutes to check for patterns of issues that come up often.

One option is to spend more time having back and forth conversations during technical review to clean a course before it goes on the agenda. Another option is to have course authors have discussions with their division representatives for guidance on what to do.

There was a suggestion to have more descriptive prompts in CurricUNET when writing a course. The Chair replied that this is being discussed at the district level. The curriculum handbook is a useful resource. Having clearer and more specific instructions that address the common things we discuss would streamline course review and approval. For example, we have had many discussions about SLOs – whether they are measurable or not. It might help to have examples of measurable and non-measurable SLOs. Other issues that come up include correction of typographical errors and spelling.

An option is to schedule the first meeting of the month for technical review and have the second meeting for other conversations. Another option is to have course submission seasons: schedule course reviews in fall only and no reviews will be done in spring.

Are there best practices for COI? The Chair pulled up a document that has information on course review. The State Senate has a Curriculum Committee that was tasked with reviewing this document: how to write a course outline, how to run a meeting, etc. This is a good resource for writing course outlines.

- **Discipline assignments**  
The Disciplines List is a statewide document. Last year, we had discussions on courses that had multiple discipline assignments. Going forward, we need to assign discipline assignments to each course. We have no policy on this but historical practice had been to assume that the discipline assignment was the same as the course prefix. We can create the policy. Staff need to understand that the prefix and the discipline assignment are not always the same thing. The Chair will talk to the deans at the Instructional Administrators Council meeting in September, then will attend the division meetings in October to discuss discipline assignments. The Chair anticipates backup from COI reps. Maybe the COI reps can draw up a list of courses to review if there are any that might potentially have multiple discipline assignments.

We need to talk about the content of the course and the educational background required to teach it, without regard to personalities. Divisions and departments need to talk to each other. In some cases, the prefix makes a difference, e.g., prefix has to be MATH or PHYS. We need to document the eligibility of faculty to teach. There is an impact on students. If someone teaches a course for which they don't have the appropriate educational background to teach the discipline, credit will not be given; the State could invalidate the course and the degree. There could also be articulation issues. A course with multiple disciplines might be approved for articulation in one discipline but not in another.

It is anticipated that for the majority of courses, the discipline assignment will be the same as the prefix. Some courses might need discussions. We can take discipline assignments by memo. Send a list to COI, with course and discipline assignments. If they are clearly the same, there will be no further discussion.

A member suggested getting something down in writing with information on what needs to be done, what to prepare. The Chair will do some research to see if there are existing policies in other schools that we can look at.

A member followed up on the policy on SLOs. We do not have a policy yet. We can discuss this in September.

**Meeting adjourned at 3:48 pm.**