College of San Mateo

Curriculum Committee

August 26, 2021 (2:15 p.m.)

https://smccd.zoom.us/j/84605851697?pwd=Zkx5NHRCV3k3OVJTdTZ4aVk0cncyZz09

MINUTES

Members Present

Chair	Christopher Walker
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	David Laderman
Library	Matthew Montgomery
Math/Science Division	Beth LaRochelle, Christopher Smith,
Student Services	Martin Bednarek, Alex Guiriba
Non-Voting Members	Marsha Ramezane, Ada Delaplaine, Alma Gomez,
Absent/Excused	Mike Holtzclaw, Jeremy Ball
Other Attendees	Teresa Morris, Madeline Wiest

Chair, Chris Walker called the meeting to order at 2:17 p.m.

I.   **Call to Order (a quorum is eight voting members)**

II. **Approval of Agenda**

III. **Open Agenda**

- Welcome and introductions
  The committee members introduced themselves. Most of the members have served on the committee for a few years. The only new member is Beth LaRochelle from Dental Assisting. We are waiting for one more member from Language Arts. We do not have a student representative yet.

- CSM Curriculum Committee roles and responsibilities
  The Curriculum Committee is composed of representatives from different divisions, along with representatives from the Office of the Vice President of Instruction, the Articulation Officer, the Registrar, and an ASCSM student representative. We will also be joined by the new Distance Education Coordinator, Donna Eyestone (DGME

faculty), and one of the new Instructional Designers.

Curriculum is a very important part of what we do in a community college. It is part of the 10+1 things that faculty have control over. The list includes: degree and certificate requirements; grading policies; educational program development; standards or policies regarding student preparation and success; and others.

Laws govern what the Curriculum Committee does, e.g., Title 5 (Division 6). Title 5 requires that Chancellors put out their own guidelines for course approval and we do this through the Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH). We also rely on Chancellor's Office memos for guidance. We added the Disciplines List in 2018. Locally, we follow District policies and procedures, and generate our own CSM Curriculum Handbook, and the CSM General Education Handbook. We have been working on these documents for a while and the Chair would like to bring these to the attention of the committee at a future meeting.

- Curricular Process Overview
  The Curriculum Committee reviews Course Outlines of Record (CORs) following certain standards as outlined in 55002: Standards and Criteria for Courses. This is what we see in the course outlines. The Chair pointed to the All Fields Report in CurricUNET. Some of the fields are required by State Regulation, e.g., Course Number, Title, Prerequisites/Corequisites/ Recommended Preparation; Units; Total Contact Hours, etc. In addition to these fields, CSM also reviews SLOs, TBA Hours, College Level Reading and Writing Assignments, and others. Since most of the committee members are familiar with CurricUNET, the Chair did not delve deeply into this, but he will be happy to meet one-on-one with people who have questions.

  The Chair invited members to look at the process and see if there are things that we want to tweak or change to improve. The committee is about the "why" of courses, and not just the desire for courses. There are factors to consider: like the needs should arise from program review, documented labor market, follow master educational planning, not cause harmful competition to other colleges, and be based on student needs and demands. We don't want to propose and approve courses that we won't offer or get canceled.

  Chris Smith asked about the committee's role in reviewing and approving a program if we don't have the capacity to offer it in terms of resources: facilities, faculty, or others. Can we say "No"? The Chair pointed out that there are sections in the COR that ask about Resources including Library Resources. Teresa Morris, CSM Academic Senate Co-President added that there is a law that requires that we look at library and learning resources, tutoring, and other support. Such needs should be identified in program review. This is a law and we can indicate that we don't have the needed resources but this doesn't constitute a full stop in course or program approval, just a warning that there are not enough resources for the course or program. There have been conversations about this, but they have not been robust. We need more robust conversations.

Mounjed Moussalem recounted that at CIS for example, they have created 3 new certificates in the past 10 years: DevOps, Computer Gaming, and Computer Security. These may have been created per Advisory Committee recommendations, which while useful, might be biased. Institutions can give advice but we have to use our own judgment. There are problems with getting faculty to teach, and then, when they do find faculty, they do not get enough students. Lale Yurtseven added that they have a similar situation in Business. We have to look at industry data before making curriculum additions or changes. We also might need more marketing or dissemination of information. Students might not be aware of what we are offering. Before we think of banking programs, we should see if marketing them better would help.

The Chair mentioned that he had met with the Curriculum Chairs of the other campuses and they are discussing the possibility of asking for required documentation at the start of the curriculum process and review rather than at the end. Do we want to make changes to the way we currently review certificates and programs?

- Articulation
Marsha Ramezane, Articulation Officer, commended the committee for the wonderful job done last year under the leadership of Teresa Morris, who guided the committee through the cleaning up and updating of the local Associate degree GE worksheet. She also thanked Judith Hunt for reviving World History courses which are needed by students transferring as History majors.

Marsha explained that articulation works to connect our curriculum to universities to create a smooth process for students who are planning to transfer. Articulation work has been much easier since the Curriculum Committee has done such a great job in helping create and approve good course outlines. Marsha works with colleges and universities to get our curriculum approved for lower division major transfer and lower division GE or electives. The committee makes decisions on courses at CSM. We also decide on courses transferability to CSUs based on the very basic transferability to the CSU system. The committee, however, doesn't decide on transferability to UCs.

After the committee approves a course, Marsha looks at the universal curriculum and looks at universities to see how that course might transfer as a GE course or a lower division major prep or as an elective. Marsha submits CSM courses for CSU GE approval in December. If approved, she will submit the courses for IGETC articulation.

UCs have an extra step in the process. Submissions are done in June, and Marsha hears back a couple of months later. Once a course is UC-approved, if it is relevant to lower division GE (IGETC), Marsha submits the course the following December. It takes about a full year for a course to get appropriate GE articulation. Articulation is never retroactive, although it had been retroactive in the past. Articulation attributes are found in the catalog, at the bottom of the course description.

WebSchedule also shows the articulation attributes. Marsha would love to show the committee a tool that counselors use all the time: assist.org. It's a valuable resource for checking articulation.

At a future meeting, Marsha would like the committee to go over our three worksheets: the CSM local associate degree information, the CSU GE pattern, and the IGETC pattern. The worksheets look complicated and Marsha would like to make them less complicated. The Chair agreed that it will be beneficial for Marsha to come back and talk us through the GE patterns. He and Marsha will schedule a meeting for this discussion at the committee.

Courses that are approved by the Curriculum Committee can be offered the following fall, with the approved GEs. The results of Marsha's December submissions come out the following May. There is enough time to get new or modified courses into the new catalog with their proper articulation, but there might not be enough time for Deans to schedule the class without knowing the full articulation.

Marsha reminded the group that articulation changes over time. When reviewing courses, we have to consider the time context. For example, the articulation of a History class taken now may be different from how it articulated 10 years ago.

- The Brown Act
  We have had discussions on the Brown Act in previous years and last year, it was much talked about because people were working from home and attending meetings by Zoom. For now, we are still under the State waiver that allows virtual meetings until the end of September. We don't know yet what will happen after this date. The Board has started doing hybrid meetings with having some people in the Boardroom while some are virtual. Academic Senate is doing full Zoom meetings for now. The Chair has been in conversations with some people and they have heard that there are multiple bills going through the State Senate and Assembly to make modernization improvements to the Brown Act, in view of everything that has happened in the past year.

  Judith Hunt thinks that as long as we have Zoom links that are open to the public, there shouldn't be a problem. The issue might not be of modality but of accessibility. Teresa pointed out that the Brown Act was written in another era and some of the language may seem archaic. She feels the spirit of the Brown Act is one thing, and the way it is right now is something different. Initially, Teresa had thought that there was enough flexibility in the Act to deal with new technologies, but different people interpret the language differently; definitions and interpretation of language like "teleconferencing" differ. The original interpretation of teleconferencing was that everyone on the teleconference or Zoom call should be in a place where other people can join them as committee members in the teleconference. The Act requires that teleconferencing spaces be open to the public, not just the original room where the meeting is to be held, but if we need to broadcast the meeting, it has to be open to the public. Is it good enough if the meeting room on campus is open and the link is available on the Curriculum Committee website? Teresa thinks

this is a common sense interpretation but even pre-pandemic, this was not the common interpretation. This is an important discussion to have; it will come back to Academic Senate. It is beyond our institution and the Board will have to deal with this, too, since it comes from the State. We might end up having to follow what County Counsel says we are able to and are not able to do. Teresa is open to more conversations about this.

The Chair told the group that he attended the Curriculum Institute's session on the Brown Act and found out that there are bases in historical precedent and in court cases, and the interpretations are based on this.

Judith commented that the pandemic has forced us to think about accessibility, equity, and the environment. There are still folks facing challenges brought on by the pandemic, including child care or access to technology and internet. There are faculty who are teaching fully remotely; for some, this works better for them, and at the same time, there is a demand from students for online classes. It could be a challenge to such faculty to function in committees if they are required to come to campus to attend meetings. Whoever makes decisions should consider accessibility, equity, and responsible citizenship in decision-making.

The Chair added that with our teaching, we have seen what is possible now that we might not have thought about before. Since the Covid pandemic started, people have changed their ways of thinking. His department is now more conscious about scheduling classes, e.g., what classes to offer and what modality. This is probably happening all over the campus. We will not go back to what was normal in 2019 before Covid hit.

The Curriculum Committee is one of only a few college committees that is beholden to the Brown Act, along with Academic Senate and CTL. Other institutional committees don't need to follow the Brown Act. Standing Committees of a legislative body are **always** subject to the Brown Act. Standing Committees have a continuing subject matter jurisdiction or a meeting schedule fixed by resolution of formal action of the legislative body.

A meeting is defined as "any congregation of a majority of the members of a legislative body at the same time and location to hear, discuss, deliberate, or take action upon any item that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the legislative body." GC- Section 54952.2(a). The Brown Act is not limited to meetings where a final decision is made.

Serial meetings are not allowed. A serial meeting occurs when a majority of members have communicated about an issue and have developed concurrence. Collective concurrence occurs when members have directly or indirectly heard each other's opinion on a topic enough to collectively develop or begin to develop an agreement on an issue. This could happen by way of email chains or other communication methods.

Meetings should be open to the public and anybody should be able to join. This is why we post our meetings and agenda on the Curriculum Committee website. We haven't made it a practice to post paper copies of the agenda in the meeting rooms. Teresa mentioned that in the past, there had been a historical expectation that Deans would post the agenda in meeting rooms, but it's not strictly followed. Agendas must be posted at least 72 hours before the meeting in a location that is freely accessible to members of the public. We try to send out the CC agenda a week ahead but sometimes, there are delays and the agenda might go out on a Friday or the following Monday. The notice, agenda, and supporting documents are public records and must be made available to the public. All "Ayes", "Nays", and abstentions on motions must be attributed to the member casting a vote.

Committees are allowed to add agenda items if 2/3 of members are present, there is need for immediate action, and the need to take action came to the attention of the committee after the agenda had been posted. Agenda for regular meetings must allow members of the public to speak on any item of interest within the subject matter of jurisdiction of the legislative body, even if the item is not on the agenda.

The Chair asked the committee if there were additional questions or comments or if anyone wanted to share ideas or observations related to the Curriculum Committee meetings and how we are going to structure them. Are there things we need to change? Chris added that he has served on the Curriculum Committee for several years and has found the committee cordial and not contentious, and he doesn't see a need for change, but he is open to suggestions. Some colleges and committees run their meetings more strictly, following Robert's Rules of Order like having to get on a list in order to speak and waiting for one's turn to speak. Other committee members chimed in about the collegiality in Curriculum Committee.; there is no need for stricter rules. The chocolates and candy at the meetings are also much appreciated and the Chair promised to bring some when we start having in-person meetings. The Office of the VPI orders pizza at the last meeting of the fall and spring semesters.

- Curriculum certification process – updates and changes
  CSM has been doing self-certification for allowed curricular approvals for the past few years and we will continue to do so. There is a memo that we submit to the Chancellor's Office that entitles the college to automatic approval of:
    - All credit courses (including cooperative work experience)
    - Modifications to all existing credit programs except for ADTs. (Note: changing program goal will require a new program submission.)
    - New credit degrees and certificates with a program goal of local (not ADTs or CTE)
    - CTE C-ID Aligned Programs – recommended by 5C

Participating in State certification speeds up the process to propose, review, and approve courses and programs and offer them at the soonest time. We need to show that we used the PCAH to review credit courses. The PCAH comes from the Education Code in Title 5. We also use the CCCCO Course Calculations as a guide.

Things to keep in mind:
- Colleges must submit all courses to the Chancellor's Office using the Chancellor's Office Curriculum Inventory (COCI).
- Colleges are still required to have a course control number before they can offer a course.
- The Chancellor's Office still reviews and approves all noncredit, new and revised ADTs, and new CTE programs and they conduct periodic reviews on all courses receiving automatic approvals.

Once the Curriculum Committee approves a course or program, the Office of the VPI sends a report to the Board for approval. Once Board-approved, Ada Delaplaine, Curriculum and Instructional Systems Analyst, submits and uploads the information into COCI. The approval process used to take a lot of time but now that we are self-certifying, it has been much quicker.

Legislative Updates
The Chair presented three legislative updates and will continue to provide updates as they come:
- AB 1111 – Common Course Numbering
- AB 927 – Statewide Baccalaureate Degree pilot
- Continued guidance for AB 705 implementation for ESL

2021-2022 Goals
- Address District "alignment" for policies, programs, and courses
- Integrate Guided Pathways in the curriculum process
- Update Curriculum Handbook and other documents
- Address equity in curriculum
- Updates on Information Competency Graduation Requirement (implemented in 2010 and needs review)

Program Mapper will go live very soon. Allie Fasth will join us in a Curriculum Committee meeting and we can discuss how to integrate Guided Pathways into our curriculum process. Chris has been working on updating the Curriculum Handbook and the GE Handbook and will bring updated versions to the committee to share and get input.

Teresa mentioned that there have been questions about reviewing and updating programs. Unlike courses which follow a two or six-year review cycle, programs don't have a similar review cycle. This impacts several places. Programs might only get updated when a course is banked or the units change. There is for example, a degree in Engineering Technology that hasn't been updated since the 1970s. There haven't been any changes to the courses and the program.

Beth LaRochelle mentioned that they have to update their program regularly, but this is partly because they are under an accrediting body that has its own rules and regulations. There is no State law that says we have to review programs. Do we want to make a local change and have a cycle for program review? Teresa added that technically, programs should be looked at for possible changes during program review. There is, however,

concern that reviewing programs on a regular basis will mean more work all around.

Lale asked if discipline assignments would be covered under the Update Curriculum Handbook goal. Some discussion might be helpful; sometimes, faculty have some issues with discipline assignments and trying to figure out if a course can be cross listed and what the implications and impact are on qualified faculty to teach.

Meeting adjourned at 3:54 p.m.