

# College of San Mateo

Curriculum Committee

April 15, 2021 (2:15 p.m.)

<https://smccd.zoom.us/j/81117433580?pwd=cDRQVnBQTUpLK2F0UzJJbzNKYTNodez09>

## MINUTES

### Members Present

Chair	Teresa Morris
Academic Support and Learning Technologies	Ron Andrade
Business/Technology	Mounjed Moussalem
Creative Arts/Social Science Division	Jeremy Ball, Judith Hunt
Instructional Design	Tabia Lee
Kinesiology Division	Shana Young
Language Arts Division	Evan Kaiser
Library	Matthew Montgomery
Math/Science Division	Christopher Smith, Christopher Walker
Student Services	Martin Bednarek

### Non-Voting Members

Mike Holtzclaw, Ada Delaplaine, Marsha Ramezane, Alma Gomez

### Absent/Excused Voting Members

Business/Technology	Lale Yurtseven
Language Arts Division	David Laderman
Student Services	Alex Guiriba
ASCSM	Kyle Guanzon

### Other Attendees

Allie Fasth

Chair, Teresa Morris called the meeting to order at 2:20 p.m. There are some changes to the agenda. The technical memo was moved to the substantive agenda.

*Motion by Martin Bednarek to approve the revised agenda, seconded by Chris Walker, all members voting Aye.*

### Action Items

*Motion by Martin Bednarek to approve the revised consent agenda which now only has the minutes from two previous meetings, seconded by Chris Walker, all members voting Aye. This is an amendment to an earlier motion to approve the consent agenda, motion by Chris Walker, seconded by Martin Bednarek.*

- **Approval of minutes from the meetings on February 25 and March 11, 2021**

### **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.*

- **Technical Memo – *approved* after review by Mounjed Moussalem. Motion by Chris Walker, seconded by Martin Bednarek, all members voting “Aye”.**
  - Changes to programs due to course banking or changes in titles or units
- **Open Agenda**
  - **Guided Pathways: Explorers Experience – Feedback and request for participation:**  
Allie Fasth, Interim Director of Guided Pathways talked about Explorers Experience and asked interested parties to participate. They will conduct some planning sessions on Friday mornings (tentative dates are June 18 and July 9; there is some flexibility with the dates), to talk about how we can support our students. Explorers could be undecided students or those exploring an IGETC pathway. Participants will be compensated. This will be a gathering for people from different fields. The Chair encouraged committee members to participate; they have expertise in curriculum that could be useful at the planning sessions.
  - **Language and Rationality GE Area – discussion**  
Articulation Officer Marsha Ramezane has worked on some changes in the Language and Rationality area in our GE requirements to simplify it. She is proposing to move this area from E2 to E3. We need to determine what courses belong in this area and what do not belong. We can use criteria or SLOs or some other rules or guidelines.

Chris Walker commented that this area looks convoluted because of the range of course offerings, e.g., English, Communication Studies, Math, Philosophy, Physics, Engineering, CIS, and others. The Chair explained that we are following what Title 5 has for the Language and Rationality area. Judith Hunt asked why this section has LIT. courses; these seem more appropriate for the Humanities area, and Chris Walker agrees. The Chair thinks the LIT. courses might have been there historically. Although the heading in our GE pattern reads “English, Literature, Communication, and Analytical Thinking”, we created this title ourselves; it didn’t come from Title 5. Title 5 shows Communication and Analytical Thinking and covers English courses; we can follow this language. Some committee members think that the creative writing classes (ENGL. 161, 162, and 163) belong in this area. Evan Kaiser believes that literary analysis does involve analytical thinking and he asked if there are disadvantages to having the courses listed in two areas. Judith argued that analytical thinking is not unique to Literature; courses like

History and Philosophy and Sociology also use analytical thinking. Per Marsha, the Creative Writing series is listed under the Humanities section of the CSU GE worksheet; the courses do not appear in their Communication Skills and Critical Thinking area. Martin reminded the group that the committee had previously agreed that if a course appears in a CSU GE area, we can add it to the corresponding area in our worksheet, without needing to vote on it.

The Language and Rationality area requires 6 units but students could potentially be taking more because some of the courses are 4 units. They have to take one course from E3a and another from E3b. We can change the language to say “Minimum of 6 units.”

Mounjed pointed out that some of the CIS courses in the GE list have prerequisites so students might need to take more classes before they can get to the course level they want to take. A review of scenarios can be done to make sure the courses in the list are correct.

Chris Walker explained how the Math classes are listed. They have courses in the list like MATH 222 and 225 which are pre-calculus and which are prerequisites for MATH 251 Calculus. They are able to do things this way because they have students who took pre-calculus in high school. Mounjed agreed that they are seeing students who took advanced courses in high school. The Chair thinks the CIS and MATH courses in the GE lists look okay. We need insight on what happens with students who skip courses, e.g., due to advanced placement. More food for thought: if a student takes only one course from a certain area, does this help him or her understand things that are described in that area? We need to define what goes into areas. Teresa reminded the committee that a couple of years ago, there had been an argument that ART classes should qualify for analytical thinking since students use this faculty to create their work.

ESL 400 transfers to CSUs but it doesn't meet the CSU GE requirements. Marsha submitted ESL 400 for Humanities but we are still waiting for approvals from proposals submitted in September 2019. We can shift courses around after we hear back on the CSU approvals.

Some of the language in the AS Degree worksheet was tweaked to make it clear what options are available and how many units students need to complete for each area. Lee pointed out that if we remove the Creative Writing courses from this area, we are more in alignment with Title 5. The Chair said that we can add the ENGL and LIT. courses to the Humanities area; they won't be completely taken off the worksheet. She asked Evan Kaiser to get feedback from his division on the discussions we have had. She will bring some scenarios for the next meeting.

- Distance Education – Modality
  - Discussion of CSM language used for DE

- Impact on Curriculum Committee COR review

Distance Education definitions have changed. In part, this has been brought about by changes in technology; some things are now possible that hadn't been possible before. At some point, a hybrid section had meant a certain percentage is online and a certain percentage is face-to-face. What are those percentages now, or does this concept even still apply? The Chair presented a slide showing the different icons that show up in Webschedule, including icons showing if a course is hybrid or online. Chris Smith had looked at the PCAH, and this document only indicates that hybrid means a course is partially online.

In the hybrid section of our DE supplement, there is a question that asks what parts of the course need to be taught face-to-face, implying that there is something that needs face-to-face teaching; otherwise, the class can simply be offered online. The Chair stated that we can make changes to the DE supplement, now that we have had some experience with how people respond to the questions. Some courses might have a hybrid component not because some components of the class need to be taught face-to-face, but due to faculty preference. We need to define what is required to be taught face-to-face in hybrid mode. This might be a matter of course design rather than course outlines. The course outline of record speaks to what is appropriate and possible versus the course design of an individual person. Where is the line between a course outline and a course design?

Mounjed thinks that hybrid offers more flexibility. This discussion is timely because Deans are now asking faculty about the spring 2022 schedule, and hybrid offers better flexibility. In the CIS department, for hybrid classes, some instructors hold an initial on campus meeting, then hold exams on campus. This was the practice about five years ago. Chris Walker admitted that the question in the template made him feel that he had to justify holding sessions on campus. He would prefer a DE supplement that doesn't specify how much is online and how much is on campus. As long as there's at least one meeting held on campus, the course is hybrid. Chris Smith added that online usually means asynchronous. The exams he gives for on campus and online courses are different. Judith is of the opinion that if only one on-campus meeting is required and this is communicated clearly to students, e.g., in Webschedule, it can still count as an online class. Lee shared a slide showing a Quick Reference for Instruction Mode Coding that is used by another educational institution. The document shows percentages of synchronous, asynchronous, online, and on-campus meetings. There are categories like Online Interactive, Hybrid Synchronous, Hybrid Traditional, etc.

The Chair cautioned that there are legal restrictions that need to be considered in California Community Colleges' context. Mike Holtzclaw, Vice President of Instruction, agreed, adding that we have to think about ACCJC and the State requirements. It would complicate things if we create too many categories. Students taking online classes don't expect to be physically present on campus; with hybrid courses, students know to

expect that they need to be on campus for part of the time. If the on-campus meeting is optional, this is a different case. If undecided, faculty can talk to deans about how the course is run. Some faculty think that synchronous online classes are better than asynchronous classes, but we have to factor in students' access or ability to attend the synchronous classes. We have had international students who had to return to their own countries due to the Covid pandemic, and their time zones could be different. We have to be as explicit as possible, make it very clear to students if we expect them to be available and when, how many hours, etc. This information should be clear in our advertising of classes and on Webschedule. There are different expectations when we hear the words "online" and "hybrid". The categories in the slide that Lee presented show numbers of hours, breakdowns of percentages, etc. in the different modalities of teaching; there will be consistency if a model like this is used. Chris Walker asked where we could incorporate the detailed information that Lee had been alluding to, e.g., in the course outline, in the schedule? It would appear to be more appropriate to have the details in the schedule rather than in a course outline that different faculty will be using to teach a class. He added that it would be difficult to get consistency within departments, let alone among different disciplines.

The Chair presented an example of a DE form used around 10 or more years ago. The form shows the breakdown of hours, e.g., how many minutes of viewing time, how many hours of independent work, how many hours of on-campus meetings, etc.

Lee is getting a group together to come up with clarity and make recommendations.

For the next meeting, we will have some edits to the General Education Handbook and the Curriculum Handbook. PCAH may have some changes, too.

Judith followed up on the student survey that went out asking for their preference for instruction, e.g., online or in person. Mike replied that PRIE is working on getting the survey results. He will ask Hillary Goodkind.

The Chair mentioned that there are Academic Senate positions open, in case Curriculum Committee members are interested.

**Meeting adjourned at 4:01 pm.**