

College of San Mateo

Curriculum Committee
August 22, 2019 (2:15 p.m.)

MINUTES

Members Present

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

Non-Voting Members

Marsha Ramezane, Ada Delaplaine, Alma Gomez,

Absent/Excused

ASCSM	TBD
-------	-----

Excused Non-Voting Members

Mike Holtzclaw, Jeremy Ball

Other Attendees

Rene Anderson, Yvette Butterworth, Allie Fasth, Kelsey Harrison, Jane Jackson, Kristi Ridgway, Arielle Smith, Ellie Tayag, Peter von Bleichert

Chair, Teresa Morris called the meeting to order at 2:24 p.m.

Motion by Chris Walker to approve the agenda, seconded by Ron Andrade, all members voting Aye.

- I. **Call to Order (a quorum is six voting members)**
- II. **Approval of Agenda**
- III. **Open Agenda**
 - Welcome and introductions

- CSM Curriculum Committee roles and responsibilities
The Curriculum Committee is a committee of the Academic Senate. Members represent the different divisions and departments. We also have staff from the Instruction Office and from the Registrar, and the Articulation Officer. There is student representation but we do not have a representative yet. Curriculum is a purview of faculty.
- Curricular process overview
At the statewide level, we follow: Title 5 Division 6 California Community Colleges; the Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH); the Disciplines List (minimum qualifications book); and Chancellor's Office memos (e.g., SB 440, AB 705). At the local level, we have district policies and procedures which have guidelines on credit hours and grading policies, among others; the CSM Curriculum Handbook which is currently being updated; and the CSM General Education Handbook (from 2013, also to be updated).
- The Brown Act
(From slides from the Academic Senate Curriculum Institute held in the summer)
The Brown Act is about public meetings. Since the Curriculum Committee is a standing committee of Academic Senate, our meetings are covered under this act. A meeting is defined as a congregation of majority of the members of a legislative body at the same time and location to hear, discuss, deliberate, or take action. The Curriculum Committee does reviews and makes decisions. The Chair reports to Academic Senate about curriculum matters; the reports are submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Serial meetings are not allowed. An example is if the Chair would go out of the room and talk to members about her opinions on an issue, e.g., repeatability, and recommend that certain actions should or should not be done. If enough members hear the discussion, that constitutes a meeting and is a violation of the Brown Act. If an email is sent out to all committee members to discuss an issue, e.g., AB 705, and members add in their recommendations or make decisions about curricular issues, this would also be a violation.

The Chair presented two types of meetings that are not allowed: the Daisy Chain, and the Hub and Spoke meetings. A committee member might talk to another member, and more members get involved until a majority of members have been contacted and a collective concurrence has been established. She asked those present to pair up and discuss the definitions of these two meetings. Sometimes, she talks to people about curriculum matters. Is this covered under meetings that are not allowed? Chris Walker and Kristi Ridgway's take on this is that it is okay for people to have conversations as long as there is no intent to arrive at a decision prior to the meeting. Lale Yurtseven added that conversations can be held to talk about an issue where there is no intent to

manipulate outcomes.

What constitutes quorum? Half of the members plus the minimum required? The Chair will do some research on this.

The Brown Act requires that agenda be posted 72 hours in advance of the meeting, in a location that is freely accessible to the public. All notices, agenda, and supporting documents are public documents and must be made available to the public. We typically send out the agenda and minutes one week before the meetings. If there are any revisions, the last official agenda will be posted on the Curriculum Committee website 72 hours before the meeting. If other items need to be added to the agenda at the last minute, the Chair will ask for a 2/3 vote on the addition.

Going forward, we will be a little stricter with motions. We need to record who proposes a motion, and who seconds it. Proposing a motion does not mean that the person making the proposal is endorsing it. All Ayes, Nays, and abstentions on motions must be attributed to the members casting the votes.

- Articulation

Marsha Ramezane, Articulation Officer, presented information on articulation. Many CSM students have plans to transfer to 4-year universities and it's important that our curriculum allows them to transfer. Articulation is about the process of developing formal agreements that identify our courses as being comparable or equivalent to the courses in universities.

The Curriculum Committee determines if a course is degree-applicable, applicable to local CSM GE requirements, or is CSU transferable. We do not decide if a course is approved for CSU GE pattern, IGETC, or UC transferability.

The process for determining if a course is transferable to UC starts with Marsha submitting a list of courses to the UC system on June 1. A review is done and we usually get a response in mid to late August. When a course is declined, reasons are cited, usually just a few lines, not an extensive narrative. June 2019 submissions that are approved in August 2019 can be effective for Fall 2019. Articulation is date specific. If a course that has existed for some years only gets UC approval in Fall 2019 and a student took it prior to Fall 2019, it is not UC transferable.

For the CSU GE and IGETC articulation, Marsha submits a list of courses proposed for transfer to CSU GE, UC, IGETC, and American History and Institutions requirement. This is done on December 1. The results typically come back in late April or early May.

At a previous meeting, the Curriculum Committee had agreed that if a course is approved for a specific GE area at a CSU, we can put the same designation in the CSM GE area if it doesn't already have it. In the past, approvals were applied retroactively but this will no longer be the case. Going forward, courses will be approved for the following fall. For example, Marsha recently submitted ESL 400 and it was approved for the CSU GE and IGETC Humanities area effective Fall 2019. ESL 400 is now also approved for the CSM Humanities GE area.

On an ongoing basis, Marsha does research on what courses would match, and submits courses for approval to CSUs and UCs. Results are posted on assist.org. The assist.org website has recently been revised and does not yet have full functionality. The lists are not yet up to date. CSUs and UCs have to enter a lot of data, and since the system is not yet fully functional, it might take a couple of years before a course is fully articulated. She would like deans and departments to review GE patterns and if something seems to be out of place or is missing, to notify her so appropriate action can be taken.

Transfer degrees are unique. AD-Ts are designed by the CSU system and we fit our courses into the design. They are designed with the idea that community college students are taking courses in different schools and this should not inhibit their ability to transfer. Students are not held to local degree requirements. Instead of the more stringent residency requirements of our local degrees, for transfer degrees 12 units of basic residency at CSM is needed, and major courses taken elsewhere are pre-approved.

C-IDs are a way of identifying courses that are comparable to each other. Chris Smith mentioned that the C-ID system is always looking for people to help with the review process.

Marsha clarified that faculty don't need to submit requests for articulation for their courses. Marsha does this automatically based on CSU and UC rules and guidelines, and sends results to deans.

Martin Bednarek inquired about courses that are articulated differently in other colleges. Marsha replied that the three colleges try to work together but articulation doesn't always align, e.g., ACTG 100 is articulated differently at Skyline and Canada. She gives the other colleges a list of what she is doing. Teresa Morris added that we try for alignment, but we can't force other schools to submit courses for articulation. The three colleges align on prerequisites, and we have a reciprocity process, but it doesn't help with everything. Could the issue be that the other schools are not aware of the CSM courses that are being submitted for articulation, e.g. at the department level? We need communication at different levels. We can bring this discussion back.

- Curriculum certification process – updates and changes

There is a memo that is due for submission to the Chancellor's Office in October that needs to be signed by CSM's Chief Executive Officer, Chief Instructional Officer, Academic Senate President, and Curriculum Chair. The memo certifies that we have held trainings on curriculum. The memo entitles the college to automatic approval of all credit courses and modifications to existing courses - except for ADTs.

The Chancellor's Office will still conduct periodic reviews of all courses receiving automated approvals. All courses should be submitted to the Chancellor's Office through the Chancellor's Office Curriculum Inventory (COCI). We need to have control numbers from COCI prior to offering courses. Experimental courses also have numbers.

- Important CSM issues for this year
 - AB 705 Impact across curriculum

AB 705 involves changes in course offerings for Math, English, and ESL but has impacts across curriculum. The Math department has started teaching Math courses with support classes. For English, courses now start with ENGL 100 and 105. They no longer offer courses below this level. ESL has an additional year before full implementation. They are not eliminating courses from the catalog.

AB 705 affects writing, reading, and computational expectations/assumptions across the curriculum. There are cross discipline prerequisite issues. Many courses have a recommended preparation of "Eligibility for ENGL 838 or ENGL 848 or ESL 400" or prerequisites of "MATH 120 or MATH 190 or appropriate score on the college placement test". We have not asked people to change these recommended preparation or prerequisite statements on their outlines. We need to have conversations so we can better guide the preparation of course outlines, e.g., what abilities or competencies do students need to succeed in a course?

- CSM Guided Pathways and Program Inventory for Fall 2019 – presentation

The Guided Pathways team distributed copies of a Guided Pathways flier and 2019 Toolkit. There is information on what we need to communicate to students to guide them to reach their educational goals. The team has gone through the Inquiry Phase and has conducted study groups, collected data, and created a mapping toolkit. There have been discussions with divisions on principles to keep in mind to best improve student experience. Outcomes arrived at are open to change as we continue the process.

Allie Fasth, Interim Director of Guided Pathways, said that the team will be going to divisions to talk about their degrees for mapping purposes. They

have drafts of maps and need input from Math and English faculty and counselors to refine the maps. Jane Jackson added that we need to be open-minded and flexible about our degree offerings; we cannot just pigeonhole them. Students have different needs and time frames. A part-time student who is looking into finishing in three years will need a different pathway from a full-time student who can finish in two years. We need to give students opportunities to explore the best options.

The Chair inquired if during the review process, deans and faculty felt the need to make changes. Mounjed Moussalem shared that one 15-unit CIS certificate seems to require an inordinate amount of Math as prerequisites; the content could be incorporated into the course. Requiring a 4-unit Math course reduces the number of CIS courses to be taken. Maybe this certificate can be revised. Peter von Bleichert noted that having an English prerequisite for some business courses would be beneficial. There are also issues with courses being offered only in the spring or in the fall; students are unable to finish on time. It was observed that we do not have control over how scheduling is done in different divisions.

Anniqa Rana announced that there are professional development opportunities available for Guided Pathways. They will post the opportunities on the website.

There were some comments that some of the links on websites are not active, or have outdated information. Different divisions and departments update their own websites. Is the Guided Pathways team working with IT to remove or update dead links? Lale Yurtseven mentioned that they had notified IT about some issues but these are not resolved immediately. Kristi Ridgway informed the group that they are taking notes and will try to close loops.

The Chair announced that we will invite the Guided Pathways team back to another meeting.

- General Education Review of 2018-19 progress - ***postponed***
- Impact of CSM's new Student Learning Outcomes process - ***postponed***
- Review of 2018-2019 goals - ***postponed***

Meeting adjourned at 4:08 p.m.