College of San Mateo

Curriculum Committee
April 23, 2020 (2:15 p.m.)
https://smccd.zoom.us/j/96652719915?pwd=MThzU3dIZ3FHUGI1TVlxVmk4cWhNQT09

MINUTES

Members Present
Chair	Teresa Morris
Academic Support and Learning Technologies	Ron Andrade
Business/Technology	Lale Yurtseven
Creative Arts/Social Science Division	Judith Hunt
Kinesiology Division	Shana Young
Language Arts Division	Evan Kaiser
Library	Matthew Montgomery
Math/Science Division	Christopher Smith, Christopher Walker
Student Services	Alex Guiriba, Martin Bednarek

Non-Voting Members   Mike Holtzclaw, Ada Delaplaine, Marsha
                                        Ramezane, Alma Gomez

Absent/Excused
Business/Technology	Mounjed Moussalem
Creative Arts/Social Science Division	Nico van Dongen
Language Arts Division	Fermin Irigoyen II
ASCSM	Shiyun Tao

Other Attendees   Laura Demsetz, Heidi Diamond, Allie Fasth,
                                         Arielle Smith

Chair, Teresa Morris called the meeting to order at 2:20 p.m.

Motion by Martin Bednarek to approve the revised agenda, seconded by Chris Walker, all members voting Aye. The Chair added "Plans for DE Addendum" to Open Agenda items.

Public Comments
The meeting is being recorded but the recording will not be posted on the website; it will be deleted once the minutes are done.

Action Items

Motion by Chris Walker to approve the revised consent agenda, seconded by Martin Bednarek, all members voting Aye. There is a correction to a typo in the April 9, 2020 minutes.

- **Approval of April 23, 2020 Minutes**

Substantive Agenda
Courses listed on the substantive agenda have been reviewed for listed changes. Though courses on the substantive agenda may have changes in prerequisites and/or recommended preparation, the full committee is expected to review prerequisites and recommended preparations statements for all proposals to ensure compliance with Title 5 regulations.

- **Discipline Assignment – by memo**
  CRER   100   Career Planning and Life Exploration (3) – ***approved; discipline assignment: Counseling.*** *Motion by Chris Walker, seconded by Martin Bednarek, all members voting Aye.*
  (Textbook updates per suggestions at the 3-26-20 meeting)

- **Open Agenda**
  - DE Regular and Substantive Contact Policy

    The Chair explained the DE waiver process for summer and fall 2020. There is a stipulation that we create a plan to have DE addendums for courses we are offering online in the summer. We need a plan but are not necessarily required to have the DE addendums completed in order to receive the DE waivers. What kind of work is entailed, and what standard are we using to create the addendum? CSM does not have a policy for regular and effective contact yet. We need to submit plans by May 15th for summer courses and by July 1st for fall classes. Fully online and hybrid courses are both considered as distance education.

    Given that there is a chance that we will need to teach fall courses online, Chris Smith asked if there has been any survey on how faculty feel about this. Teresa replied that there has been no survey. It is possible that we won't be able to offer many GE areas if we do not come up with a plan. Chris Walker reported that in their division, they had been contacted individually to ask if they were okay with teaching summer classes online, and if so, what mode they will use for teaching. Teresa added that having to teach classes online is fine with courses that are appropriate to teach online; not all courses fall under this category.

    The Chair presented a document that shows the number of course offerings for spring, summer, and fall 2020, broken down into those offered online and those scheduled for face to face instruction. There are a number of courses that have DE supplements and could have been offered online, but were scheduled as face to face. One way of preparing to go completely online in coming semesters is to group courses into tiers.

The chair presented three possible tiers. She would like feedback on her ideas, for further discussion at the next meeting.

1. Tier 1: courses that currently do not have DE supplements, but which would be easy to convert into online formats, e.g., Literature classes.
2. Tier 2: Courses that are generally not taught online due to facilities requirements or other reasons, even in other schools. The DE supplements for these are harder to write and faculty will need more support in writing the supplements to meet the standards.
3. Tier 3: These course are hard to convert to DE due to facilities and student population reasons, e.g., Adapted PE courses.

Chris Walker reminded the group that there are courses that have severely deficient DE supplements, e.g., those that have DE supplements 5 years or older, approved when we weren't scrutinizing the supplements very closely.

Evan Kaiser reported that they had already been considering proposing ESL courses for distance education prior to the COVID outbreak, and the situation has just made the need more urgent.

Chris Smith asked if hybrid education could be an option for courses like Biology (with labs), where part of the class could be taught following social distancing protocols. Some Biotechnology faculty have good suggestions for teaching hybrid classes. The Chair replied that this is possible. Hybrid courses are still considered online and will need DE supplements, and will need to follow standards.

Mike Holtzclaw, Vice President of Instruction, said that for courses that are proposed as hybrid, e.g. a Biotechnology class, we need to think about scenarios including one in which hybrid is not an option and we do not have a choice except to teach in fully online mode. The State wants to have resiliency in the future; we should have a mechanism that allows us to shift teaching modes if necessary. The State is giving schools more leeway right now, but this is only temporary.

Judith Hunt inquired if there is a district policy for continuity of education in cases of emergency, e.g., fire, earthquake, pandemic. If the school is closed for 72 hours or more, do we shift to distance education if possible? Mike replied that the district is working on policies for a shift to online teaching. There are a lot of emergency Standard Opearating Procedures related to the shift we've had to do as the district switched to online for instruction and student services. The Chancellor can declare an emergency, which suspends things like consultation.

Teresa asked for ideas on how we can change the way we complete the DE supplements. Do we take the form in CurricUNET, amend it, add more information, create a form, then tell faculty submitters that this is what they have to do? How do people do regular and effective contact? CurricUNET doesn't ask for or have this kind of

information. We need more details. The Chair asked committee members to think about the language in the draft DE Guidelines: best practices to facilitate student learning; see if we have wiggle room for changes; make sure to take accountability into consideration.

The Chair presented Draft 3: Policy on Regular and Substantive Contact. There are requirements we need to satisfy. The language comes partly from the statewide DE Committee. What is our definition of frequency? She will send a link to the document. CurricUNET has checkboxes for online, hybrid, and face-to-face, but we don't track the distinctions clearly. Judith cautioned that we should think about the distinctions since this is vital to our ACCJC accreditation.

The Chair asked the group to comment on the draft and inform her if they disagree with any of the content or language. Chris Smith suggested replacing the word "parallel" with equitable. Chris Walker noted that we have to be consistent in the use of "learning management system" versus "course management system". We should use the same language throughout the document.

There was a discussion on using "correspondence course" in the language. Correspondence course has a different meaning in the present context, versus what we think of as a correspondence course in the past, e.g. in the 1980s and earlier. There is a legal definition for correspondence course and we cannot use this. Judith asked if our definition of an online course means that faculty can't just can their face to face lectures and post them online. Lale added that faculty shouldn't just use post course content from the publisher, be on stand by for students, and consider this as online learning. There is more to DE than being a facilitator of publishers' content. Faculty should know the subject matter content and actively participate in discussions. Judith commented that frequency of contact doesn't equate to quality or effectiveness of contact.

Some of the language for regular and effective contact comes from Title 5 §55204. We have to respond to the language on regular and effective contact between faculty and students, and among students. This is an academic and professional matter. CSM will decide what we mean by regular and substantive contact as a campus standard,. Do we go with once a week, twice a week? The Chair asked if there may be courses where it is not possible or necessary to do more times. We could go with the bare minimum. Some contacts can be regular OR substantive, and some can be regular AND substantive at the same time. Judith would like to have something that shows where our policy was informed from, to serve as a reference in the future that our decision was not randomly arrived at. Maybe we could see what Skyline and Canada have in their policy. Teresa replied that it all comes back to this being a local decision. She can make citations or notations in the document. Mike reminded the group that ACCJC will use our policy to evaluate us, and we need something quantifiable. Twice a week seems to be a popular choice. Lale Yurtseven thinks that frequency of contact also depends on the course content and topics discussed in certain weeks. In some cases, once a week might be

enough, .e.g., in cases where the faculty gives out a weekly assignment and checks once a week. In other weeks, in the same course, the faculty could have multiple contacts.

A discussion on documentation of office hours followed. These also have to be regular and substantive; virtual office hours can be done by audio, phone call, or Zoom. If we make office hours substantive, they need to be documentable. It was the group's consensus that faculty contact with students during office hours should not be recorded and stored in a public area. There are privacy issues; some of the discussion is confidential. Knowing that they are being recorded would inhibit students from discussing sensitive or confidential issues. It should be enough to have office hours posted. Laura Demsetz, Dean of Creative Arts and Social Sciences suggested having a record of how many students availed of faculty office hours, without recording what was discussed. We can record office hours in Zoom without recording the actual interactions; Zoom cam record the date, time, and who logged into the meeting. Mike reported that even when faculty did office hours virtually or on campus, ACCJC never asked for documentation that the faculty was actually live or in the office during office hours. Having information on office hours in the syllabus is enough. The Chair will remove the information on documentation of office hours from the document.

The section in Appendix B on student to faculty contact doesn't mention office hours. This section contains samples of such contact. Lale asked what the bullet on asynchronous lecture mean, having lectures available to students and having students give feedback to the instructor?

Mike suggested that one type of student contact could include faculty dividing the class into groups and checking in and weighing in on the groups' interactions, whether in synchronous or asynchronous mode. This could fall under faculty to student contact.

The last area is student-to-student contact. Anything documentable will be substantive. Chris Smith noted that students tend to chat with each other in online forums. Some of the chats are not course-specific, but include social interactions. Lale added that students interact in cyber-cafes, e.g. ask if there have been any issues with accessing class materials like videos. She builds chat times into her courses. Students like to talk to each other, especially now that everyone is so isolated.

The revised draft policy will be presented to Academic Senate. The Chair thanked those who made comments on the DE policy. By our next meeting in May, the policy might already have been approved. She invited the group members to participate in Academic Senate meetings.

When the situation goes back to normal and we can hold classes on campus again, Judith asked if it would be possible to have flexibility in teaching modes under certain situations, e.g., if the faculty is sick, can online education be a temporary option? Lale thinks this would depend on the faculty and the course. She posts face-to-face class in

Canvas; students who miss a class can access the materials like assignments. Judith is thinking of scenarios where the faculty can't be on campus, e.g., is self-quarantining but is well enough to teach. This would mean that we will not need to scramble to find a substitute to teach a class. Can Mike bring this question up to the next level? This might be an issue we can bring to Academic Senate or to AFT.

At the May meeting, we will make plans for the tiers.

- Plans for DE Addendums

- Local GE Lifelong Learning and Self-Development – last comments
  Committee members reported that they presented the revised E5d definition at their division meetings. The feedback has been positive, but no further changes were recommended. Counseling faculty like the draft from the 4-9-20 meeting. Evan said that the 1st draft seems a little more flexible (Option 1).

- Local GE Area E5b: Social Science - ***postponed***

Meeting adjourned at 4:03 pm.