

College of San Mateo

Curriculum Committee

September 9, 2021 (2:15 p.m.)

<https://smccd.zoom.us/j/85813746661?pwd=VkF2VGdUTWRJLzFuS0htbXkzcVZqQT09>

MINUTES

Members Present

Chair

Christopher Walker

Academic Support and Learning Technologies

Ron Andrade

Business/Technology

Mounjed Moussalem, Lale Yurtseven

Creative Arts & Social Science

Jeremy Ball

Kinesiology Division

Shana Young

Language Arts Division

Evan Kaiser, David Laderman

Library

Matthew Montgomery

Math/Science Division

Beth LaRochelle, Christopher Smith,

Student Services

Martin Bednarek, Alex Guiriba

Non-Voting Members

Mike Holtzclaw, Marsha Ramezane, Ada Delaplaine, Alma Gomez,

Absent/Excused

Judith Hunt

Other Attendees

Donna Eyestone, Teresa Morris, Michelle Mullane, Michelle Schneider, Madeline Wiest

Chair, Chris Walker called the meeting to order at 2:15 p.m.

The Chair flipped the order of the Consent and Substantive agenda. The committee needs to approve a new course: BUS. 113 in the Substantive Agenda prior to reviewing a program change to the Business Administration degree due to the addition of the new course as a selective. Motion by Ron Andrade to approve the revised agenda, seconded by Martin Bednarek, all members voting "Aye."

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 V regulations.

• **New Course**

- BUS. 113 Personal Finance (3) – **approved with changes in the description and SLO #4; discipline assignment: Business.** Motion by Martin Bednarek, seconded by Chris Smith, all members voting "Aye." No action on the proposal for C1 CSM Competency requirements; this needs discussion at the district level for alignment issues.)

(New DE Supplement; proposed for C1 CSM Competency Requirements)

This course is offered at both Canada and Skyline Colleges; our version was cloned from Skyline. The department is thinking of maybe offering a certificate in Personal Finance in the future.

Ron Andrade asked about ACTG 119 (Personal Financial Planning) which is similar to BUS. 113. Lale Yurtseven explained that there is really little difference between the two. They have been in discussions with the Dean, and it seems more appropriate to offer this as a Business course rather than an Accounting one. We need to consider the discipline assignment and faculty qualified to teach it. The ACTG 119 class might be banked, or will be taught in alternate semesters with the BUS. 113 version.

Re Ron's question on the appropriateness of the Math language, Lale explained that they had copied the language from the other colleges. The Chair noted that the language is irrelevant with the implementation of AB 705. Lale will contact the Chair and the other schools to get a consensus on the language. We need district-wide alignment on this.

David Laderman had some suggestions to revise the course description and Lale was amenable to the changes. David added that he had recommended changes, unaware of alignment issues with the other colleges.

Chris Smith had a question on enrollment. Lale explained that CSM's ACTG 119 Personal Finance class has good enrollment; they anticipate that enrollment will continue to be robust. For now, the plan is to offer the BUS. course every other semester, to alternate with offerings of the ACTG 119 class.

Chris Smith also inquired about using OER in the textbook section. He dropped a link in Chat to OER for Personal Finance. Lale said she will look into it. Faculty have started leaning towards OER, and she will look at the ones for Personal Finance. She had looked at some OER resources for other Business courses but hadn't been very happy with them. Chris said that dissatisfaction with existing OERs could be opportunities to improve them. Lale recounted that she had been approached about writing material for OER, but it's very time-consuming. Chris thinks it's a good idea to keep OER in mind when writing course proposals and to include them as textbook options if appropriate.

The course was approved without the proposed CSM C1 Competency Requirement. Ada Delaplaine, Curriculum Analyst, reported that Canada has the C1 Competency, but Skyline doesn't. Mike Holtzclaw, Vice President of Instruction, recommended bringing this discussion to the district level; there should be alignment across the district. Teresa Morris, Academic Senate Co-President, cautioned that Title 5 is very specific about the Math competency criteria.

Mounjed Moussalem inquired about general guidelines on alignment. Some of the CIS courses don't align across the district. Some CSM courses have prerequisites that Skyline or Canada either don't have or had previously taken out. CSM is aligned with Foothill and De Anza. The Chair replied that there are no general guidelines on alignment. This is one of the big issues we hope to address within the next couple of years among the three colleges. At what point can we require alignment? When do we allow colleges to make their own separate choices, etc.? Mike added that ideally, prerequisites are in alignment. In instances when we are not in alignment, students could try to work around the prerequisites and take the course at the college that doesn't require them. Ideally, discipline faculty across the district would come into agreement; students try to get

around barriers and will take courses elsewhere. He suggests that discipline faculty at CSM contact their colleagues at Canada and Skyline and look at data analysis. He advised that Deans get involved in the discussions; they can offer perspective.

- **Course Modifications**

DGME 128 Media Performance & Presentation (3) - **approved.** Motion by Martin Bednarek, seconded by Chris Smith, all members voting "Aye."
(New DE Supplement; textbook update)

FIRE 797 Emergency Medical Technician (11) – **approved.** Motion by Martin Bednarek, seconded by Ron Andrade, all members voting "Aye."
(Change in prerequisites)

The prerequisites changed to add an age requirement: for a student to be at least 18 years old prior to the end of the course. This change is dictated by Title 22 (EMSA: Emergency Medical Services Authority). Martin Bednarek asked if the department has ever had a student complete the course younger than age 18. Michelle Schneider explained that it had been possible, before we switched from following the State Curriculum to the National Curriculum. The State Registry required a lot less hours than the National Registry. EMS is continually pushing towards higher levels of education in each scope of practice.

Action Items

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

Consent Agenda

Courses listed on the consent agenda have been reviewed for listed changes. Though courses on the consent agenda have had no 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 V regulations.

- **Program Modification**

- Business Administration – Associate in Science Degree Program: Added BUS. 113 as a selective course.
- Technical Memo
 - Update Required Selective Courses Heading and change in units for the Engineering AS Degree
 - Correct Nursing AS Degree units due to a change in the Math requirement
 - Add the new Area F to the University Transfer Option 1: California State University General Education Certification (CSUGE) Certificate of Achievement

V. Open Agenda

- CSM GE Handbook: Edits and Updates
The Chair has been working on edits and updates to the CSM GE Handbook since the summer and he presented a draft of the working version. The changes include those that were discussed and approved at previous Curriculum Committee meetings.

Further changes were made to the section on Effective Communication. "Communicate effectively" seems vague; this might mean different things to different people, in different

settings or situations. We also have to keep in mind that communication is not always verbal; there is nonverbal communication going on as well. The group discussed definitions and interpretations of the word “effective”. Who decides that something is effective; should the language be left vague enough so that the person doing the assessment makes the call? The committee revised the last bullet to read “Communicate effectively as part of a group or team situation.”

Chris Smith asked about minimum grade requirements for graduation. The committee added language that a grade of C or 2.0 or better is required to point #6 in the CSM GE Graduation Requirements. Ada pointed out that there is similar language in the CSM worksheet. The Chair will update the language in the GE Handbook to follow the worksheet. Issues could arise if students meet GPA requirements but have a grade below C; adding language on minimum grade requirements makes this section clearer. From the PCAH: *For the purpose of this section, “satisfactorily completed” means either credit earned on a “pass-no pass” basis or a grade point average of 2.0 or better in community college credit courses in the curriculum upon which the degree is based.*

There is a new section for the Ethnic Studies requirement. The Chair copied language from somewhere but needs an introductory or descriptive paragraph for this section. He asked the committee for suggestions. Recommended language can be emailed to him. Evan Kaiser suggested that the Chair get in touch with Malathi Iyengar, Ethnic Studies faculty.

The Chair pointed to the changes the committee made on the Language and Rationality area.

Marsha Ramezane, Articulation Officer opened up a discussion on the AHI requirements and how CSM meets them with our E1a and E1b areas. These two areas both need approval from CSUs, and this information should go into the GE Handbook. Our E1a courses have already been approved by CSUs for AH&I. The E1bs are approved for Ethnic Studies. Any new courses we add to these areas have to be pre-approved by the CSUs.

- Associate’s Pathway Discussion

The Chair had had a discussion with Madeline Wiest about transcript entry and how this is slightly different at each school in the district, making things difficult for the computer programming part. There is a list of areas where the colleges don’t align, and Chris would like to tackle these over the course of the next year. He thought to start with possibly thinking of new policies around an Associate’s Pathway. We currently have a Bachelor’s to Associate’s pathway in which GEs are waived if a student has a Bachelor’s and is trying to get a local Associate’s degree. The Chair dropped some information in Chat. All three colleges in the district have the Bachelor to Associate Pathway in place.

Two years ago, Skyline had adopted a similar policy of granting GE waivers for students who already have an Associate’s from a community college in California, and are working towards another. The Chair asked the committee to bring this up in division meetings and get feedback and input. Chris Smith asked if technically, this isn’t already being done. Marsha agreed that this has been happening but having a policy in place could facilitate things. If a student’s transcript notes that the student already has an Associate’s, it makes it easier for transcript evaluators to just focus on Title 5 requirements. Transcript evaluators still need to check for Title 5 requirements but it narrows down their focus and could lighten workload. Madeline added that with this in place, they won’t need to do course to course equivalency; if a student’s coursework meets Title 5, they can go in and zero out the local GEs through having “Met by Associate’s Pathway”. This could make the scripting process easier and will also benefit students. .

Mounjed opined that our Curriculum Committee does a good job of reviewing courses and programs and expect that other colleges do the same, so it makes sense to honor degrees from other 2-year colleges. He asked about timelines and expiration dates. Do GEs expire? Marsha explained that Title 5 makes this discussion more relevant. For example, students in the 1970s only needed a lower Math than is what is now being required so if they got a Bachelor's then, they still might not meet all the Title 5 requirements now; such students may still have pieces of Title 5 to complete. The same could hold true for an Associate's Pathway. Madeline added that especially with private and out-of-state schools, we need to check carefully to make sure that Title 5 requirements are met.

Chris Smith asked about the language that the Associate's Pathway does not apply to Associates for Transfer. Marsha replied that the AA-Ts and AS-Ts require CSU or IGETC approval; they are not local. Chris then asked if Skyline experienced any issues with implementing their Associate's Pathway. Madeline noted that Skyline's policy deviates slightly from Title 5. They are requiring 19 units instead of 18 units; the 1 additional unit is a lab from the Scientific Inquiry area. Skyline is not yet fully enforcing this policy; Transcript Evaluation Services is verifying the accuracy of the policy and will enforce it upon verification. Madeline added that the Ethnic Studies area is not yet in Title 5, so AAs awarded prior to the addition of Ethnic Studies will not have this area, and they can still go ahead and award our local Associate's. We can talk about partial waivers depending on how we want to proceed. Marsha reported that Title 5 for Community Colleges is being modified to add the Ethnic Studies area. Mike noted that the question would be whether we allow these to be grandfathered with having a previous Title 5 version or not.

In ending, the Chair reminded members to share our discussions with their divisions and get comments. We will bring this item up again for further discussions at a future meeting. We can discuss partial or full waivers.

Update on Brown Act waiver: Information received from the Statewide Academic Senate is that a bill is coming through to extend the waiver on in-person meetings. If signed, the bill would go into effect immediately. We should have more information by the end of the month. The Chair will keep us updated.

Meeting adjourned at 3:53 p.m.