

College of San Mateo

Curriculum Committee

September 12, 2019 (2:15 p.m.)

MINUTES

Members Present

Chair	Teresa Morris
Business/Technology	Mounjed Moussalem
Creative Arts & Social Science	Judith Hunt, Jeremy Ball
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
ASCSM	Shiyun Tao

Non-Voting Members

Marsha Ramezane, Ada Delaplaine, Alma Gomez,

Absent/Excused

Business/Technology	Lale Yurtseven
---------------------	----------------

Excused Non-Voting Members

Mike Holtzclaw

Other Attendees

Laura Demsetz, Andy Chu, Judith Lariviere, Arielle Smith

Chair, Teresa Morris called the meeting to order at 2:20 p.m. The Chair acknowledged the presence of the new Student Representative to the Curriculum Committee, Shiyun Tao. The Student Representative is a voting member. Teresa reminded the group that items on the Consent Agenda (items which do not have to be discussed), can be moved to the Substantive Agenda upon request. All items under the Substantive Agenda are discussed.

Motion by Chris Walker to approve the agenda, seconded by Shana Young, all members voting Aye.

Action Items

Motion by Martin Bednarek to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Chris Walker, all members voting Aye.

- Approval of May 9, 2019 and August 22, 2019 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.

- **New Courses**

- COUN 124 The Science of Learning in College (3) - **postponed**
(DE supplement; proposed for GE area: E5d Career Exploration and Self-Development)
- DSKL 835 Assistive Technology – Speech Recognition (1)
*Motion by Martin Bednarek, seconded by Chris Walker, all members voting Aye. – **approved; discipline assignment: Adaptive Computer Technology: Disabled Students Programs and Services***
This course had previously been offered as an experimental course. It is intended for students who need accommodations, e.g. dyslexia, spelling problems, carpal tunnel syndrome. Students could possibly have used a similar technology in high school. The version 15 that is currently in use is very good.

Open Agenda

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

The Chair presented a slide of the goals and benchmarks for 2018-2019. We also need to plan for goals for 2019-2020.

Goal: Review and approve new and modified courses and programs (ongoing)

Benchmark: Number reviewed and outcome.

Goal: Review General Education patterns for possible revisions.

Benchmark: Open forums concerning General Education requirements, Curriculum, and Academic Senate approvals for revision to GE patterns.

Goal: Discussion of recommended preparation of Reading, Writing, or quantitative skills for all courses.

With the implementation of AB 705, we should look at courses that have the generic recommended preparation of Eligibility for ENGL 838, ENGL 848, or ESL 400, and ask if

these courses really need the skills from the recommended preparation courses. Since some of these courses will no longer be offered, what other English or ESL courses can be recommended for the course outlines?

Martin Bednarek inquired if instructors can prevent students from enrolling in classes if they do not have the recommended preparation. Teresa replied that faculty cannot prevent students from enrolling in classes without the recommended preparation; this is only an advisory. Students can only be prevented from enrolling in classes if they don't have the prerequisites. We need better communication with faculty. The Curriculum Committee can help disseminate this information. Going forward, we should think about recommended preparation and prerequisites when proposing or reviewing courses. If faculty really want students to have certain skills, they should have prerequisites. Martin cited an example: CHEM 192 was removed as a prerequisite to CHEM 410; the faculty realized it wasn't necessary.

Judith Hunt commented that faculty cannot just add prerequisites so they will have select students in class. Chris Walker added that skills like writing skills are not learned in one class in one semester but developed over time. We don't require prerequisites just to weed out some students. Chris Smith recounted that in the past, some courses with prerequisites had low enrollments and had changed or removed them presumably to get more students. Some courses that are offered in common in the district's three colleges have different prerequisites and the courses are taught differently. Teresa replied that we are an open access school; colleges have the right to not require prerequisites, unless it can be proven that students will likely not succeed without the prerequisite. She added that the District Curriculum Committee is aware of this issue, but the body has no power to enforce alignment. This is an ongoing discussion and Teresa will bring it up again.

CSM Academic Senate President Arielle Smith asked about the language on prerequisites and Teresa presented the text from Title 5: California Code of Regulations §55003: Policies for Prerequisites, Corequisites, and Advisories on Recommended Preparation. We can send this information out to faculty, and emphasize that prerequisites mean one thing and recommended preparation means something else.

Jeremy Ball mentioned that in the past, students needed to show proficiency in certain skills. Chris Smith said that for Biology, prerequisites are needed to build students' skills from skills learned in the prerequisite courses. Judith added that for articulation purposes, we are promising the schools where our students transfer that our students have the knowledge and skills required for their courses or programs. Evan Kaiser noted that since courses like ENGL 828 and ENGL 838 will no longer be offered, faculty should look into the class assignments, e.g. research assignments, and determine what skills students need for their particular classes so that prerequisites or recommended preparation can be crafted accordingly. Do recommended preparation courses need to be completed prior to taking a class, or can they be taken concurrently?

Chris Walker met with Chemistry faculty to look at their curriculum and figure out what Math skills students need. Specific Math skills might be needed, not necessarily an entire class. The Department or faculty can prepare a list of important skills and hand these out to students at the beginning of the class. Teresa cautioned that we need to be consistent with this.

Re Goal #3, David Laderman suggested deleting the generic Eligibility for ENGL 838 or ENGL 848 or ESL 400 recommended preparation from those courses that have this if the classes are no longer offered. This information should not be printed in the catalog. Jeremy agreed, adding that individual faculty can add recommended preparation back in as needed.

Dean Laura Demsetz informed the group that some course descriptions have language like: "Students should be familiar with...". These are not prerequisites. Maybe we can just revise descriptions to include information on what knowledge or skills would be helpful for students in the class. Teresa said we can look into this. Students pay attention to course descriptions and recommended preparation since the information available in the catalog and webschedule is limited. Teresa said that some courses have narratives in the Recommended Preparation area, not just a list of courses. If we use this option, we will need some standard language. Laura suggested having a process where students can demonstrate the ability to pass a test rather than have recommended preparation. We should also have a way of telling students where they can get additional information or help.

Arielle suggested that as the Curriculum Committee reviews courses, to add a process for comparing CSM courses with similar courses at Skyline and Canada for prerequisites, recommended preparation, and GE designations. We can look for alignments/misalignments as part of the review process. Each Curriculum Committee at each college has the authority to override disciplines but this is not a popular move. Judith asked if there is a list of courses that are not in alignment.

Teresa will bring this issue up at the district curriculum committee level. She will ask Vice President of Instruction Mike Hotlzclaw for help in reaching out and collecting data. We can return to this discussion. In the meantime, we can ask course authors to discuss proposals or changes with their counterparts in the other colleges. Laura said we should take note of misalignments and bring these to faculty's attention.

The Chair will add the list of goals as an action item in the agenda at the next meeting.

The Chair asked the committee members to consider our GE pattern and see if we need to make any changes. We need explicit guiding principles. What is the purpose of General Education? What is needed to consider a course as meeting GE requirements? Chris Walker asked if there are objections to our local GE pattern being different from the CSU and UC patterns. Should ours be unique? Should ours be more? Less?

Different? Marsha mentioned that this discussion could have an impact on limiting some of our workforce development courses, e.g., only a few of our Cosmetology students get up getting a degree.

Teresa presented a slide with a definition of GE as a course where a student is introduced the content/skills/knowledge, not where it is just applied. She asked the group to think of courses that are considered GE and write down what the course helps students do. She distributed post-its and collected the results.

Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.