

# College of San Mateo

Curriculum Committee

March 10, 2022 (2:15 p.m.)

<https://smccd.zoom.us/j/89353939410?pwd=RnFkOFIDNVB2MEpzUytMSk1yUENgdz09>

## MINUTES

### Members Present

|                                |                              |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Chair                          | Christopher Walker           |
| Business/Technology            | Lale Yurtseven               |
| Creative Arts & Social Science | Jeremy Ball, Judith Hunt     |
| Distance Education             | Donna Eyestone               |
| Instruction Design             | Julieth Benitez              |
| Kinesiology Division           | Shana Young                  |
| Language Arts Division         | Evan Kaiser, David Laderman  |
| Library                        | Matthew Montgomery           |
| Math/Science Division          | Beth LaRochelle, Chris Smith |
| Student Services               | Alex Guiriba                 |

### Non-Voting Members

Mike Holtzclaw, Marsha Ramezane, Ada Delaplaine, Alma Gomez

### Absent/Excused

|                              |                    |
|------------------------------|--------------------|
| Business/Technology          | Mounjed Moussalem  |
| Student Services             | Martin Bednarek    |
| ASCSM Student Representative | Brittany Arriharan |

### Other Attendees

Marianne Beck, Daniel Keller, Aaron McVean

Chair, Chris Walker called the meeting to order at 2:16 p.m.

Motion by Lale Yurtseven to approve the revised agenda, seconded by Matt Montgomery, all members voting "Aye." The Chair added the Brown Act affirmation to the consent agenda; ENGL 848 was moved from consent to substantive agenda.

### Action Items

Motion by Chris Smith to approve the consent agenda, seconded by Alex Guiriba, all members voting "Aye."

- **Affirmation of Brown Act Resolution**
- **Approval of Minutes from the February 24, 2022 meeting**
- **Course Modifications**
  - CRER 155 Leadership Study (2)  
(DE update; removal of material fees; changes in description and texts)
  - DGME 215 History of Graphic Design (3)  
(Changes in methods of instruction, evaluation, and text)
  - DGME 216 Intermediate Graphic Design (3)  
(Change in texts)
  - DGME 230 Production Design for Print and Screen (3)

|      |     |  |
|------|-----|--|
| DRAF | 110 | (Correction of typo in DE; 2-year update; change in texts)<br>Solidworks I (3)<br>(DE update; changes in description, SLOs, assignments, and texts)  |
| NURS | 222 | Perinatal and Reproductive Health Nursing (4.5)<br>(2-year update; changes in title, description, SLOs, objectives, content, assignments, and texts) |
| SOCI | 100 | Introduction to Sociology (3)<br>(DE update; 2-year update; removal of frequently recommended preparation; change in texts)                          |

- **Course Deactivations**

|      |     |   |
|------|-----|---|
| ENGL | 828 | Basic Composition and Reading                     |
| ENGL | 838 | Intensive Introduction to Composition and Reading |
| READ | 400 | Academic Textbook Reading                         |
| READ | 412 | College-Level Introductory Reading Improvement    |
| READ | 413 | College-Level Advanced Reading Improvement        |
| READ | 811 | Introduction to Reading Improvement               |
| READ | 812 | Intermediate Reading Improvement                  |
| READ | 852 | Vocabulary Building Introductory                  |
| READ | 853 | Vocabulary Building Intermediate                  |
| READ | 854 | Vocabulary Improving High-Intermediate            |
| READ | 855 | Vocabulary Improving Advanced Intermediate        |

- **Program Modification**

- Nursing – Associate in Science Degree (Title changes for NURS 222 and NURS 231)

- **Program Deactivation**

- Facility Management – Certificate of Specialization

### 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.*

- **Course Deactivation**

|      |     |   |
|------|-----|---|
| ENGL | 848 | Introduction to Composition and Reading – <b>approved</b> . <i>Motion by Lale Yurtseven, seconded by Chris Smith, all members voting “Aye.”</i> |
|------|-----|---|

**Discussion on courses being banked:** The READ courses have not been offered in a long time and now, we don’t even have any READ faculty. We eliminated READ as required courses more than 10 years ago and so there is no demand for them now. ENGL 828, 838, and 848 were offered until the passage of AB 705. There is no longer any interest in these courses. Students can proceed to take ENGL 105 and get college credit.

Marsha Ramezane, Articulation Officer, expressed concern at the banking of ENGL 848. There might still be students who are not ready for ENGL 100 or 105 and need ENGL 848. With the implementation of AB 705, students lost some of the support that could be beneficial for success. Daniel Keller explained that this was taken into consideration with the recent update of ENGL 105. This course has undergone a lot of changes. With 5 units, it provides a lot of support for students and they have been successful in getting more students to get their degrees and transfer. Daniel and his colleagues had expected students to have a hard time in ENGL 105 but were pleasantly surprised that this wasn’t the case. They have not seen an increase in attrition rates. Mike Holtzclaw, Vice President of

Instruction, noted that research around AB 705 supports such findings. In conclusion, Daniel pointed out while there may be students who would benefit from more time in a class for better literacy, it could be a hard sell for students to pay for a class and not get credit.

The Chair added that they faced a similar situation in MATH. AB 705 seems counter-intuitive to some folks. ENGL and MATH faculty see students whom they can identify as having benefited from taking a lower level class before proceeding to the higher one but there could be some bias. Faculty only see the successful students and might not realize how many students got left behind. Chris Smith suggested trying to collect data on this; it would be really helpful. He asked if something similar to ENGL 848 could be offered as a Community Ed type of class. Are there people in the community that might need such classes for their workplace, as opposed to taking classes at CSM? Daniel thinks it's possible, but it would be something more targeted or industry-specific. They had offered workplace writing classes through Community Ed in the past. These kinds of classes are useful if there is interest in taking them.

The Chair announced that there has been a discussion in Academic Senate on AB 705 and he, Daniel, and Kat Webster will put together a Flex Day activity to provide updates: look at where we are at and where we hope to get to at some point. English is done with their changes and they now meet AB 705 standards. Math is almost there but some tweaks are needed. There are some gray areas, e.g., around MATH 120 which is technically a college level class that meets Math competency requirements for the local associate's degree, but it is not transferable. Mike confirmed that we can continue to offer MATH 120 for Middle College students. There are language nuances; AB 705 applies to college students who are pursuing a degree. At this point, there is still a benefit to offering MATH 120 for Middle College; classes have special codes so that only MC students can register for them. The Chair added that in the past two years, the overall pass rate for MATH transfer level classes went down a little bit but there are now more students enrolled in these classes. There is a rise in the raw number of students getting their transfer level credit, which fulfills AB 705 premises. However, some faculty are concerned about pass rates as they see fewer students passing their classes. Faculty might feel guilt or a sense of failure when students don't pass the class, but we should also consider that some students would not have reached the transfer levels and fail there because they would have failed earlier on. We are trying to find more ways to support students.

### **Open Agenda**

- Credit for Prior Learning – Marianne Beck (Program Services Coordinator – Articulation, Skyline) Aaron McVean, Vice Chancellor for Educational Services and Planning, provided some background information on Credit for Prior Learning. This is one of our efforts to follow through on our commitment to equity and social justice. There will be an impact on students, including student veterans. This has been presented to Academic Senate, Curriculum Committees, and others. Basically, we would like to give students credit for prior learning, e.g., military service, to accelerate earning their degrees.

Marianne Beck, Articulation Officer at Skyline College presented some slides. Credit for Prior Learning is college credit awarded for validated college-level skills and knowledge gained outside of a college classroom. Such could be gained through training in the military, industry, state/federal government; internships or other industry-based experiential learning, or through validated volunteer and civic activities. There are key changes to Title 5, Section 55050. The Credit for Prior Learning policy is designed to help community colleges meet goals and commitments outlined in the Vision for Success, including increasing degree and certificate completion, closing equity gaps, and meeting California's projected workforce demands. Policy reforms encourage colleges to provide students with consistent and equitable access to CPL and promote quality, integrity, and equity in awarding credit. Students who earn CPL accumulate more credits through coursework, save an average of 6-10 months to degree completion, and are about twice as likely to complete a degree. CPL is applied at the beginning of students' programs so that they come in

further along than other students and this provides motivation to persist. We use different methods of assessment to award the CPL. We already award CPL credit for external exams and AP. What is new is the awarding of credits from military transcripts and from industry-recognized credentials or through portfolio review.

There are two categories of CPL assessment: articulation and student evaluation. Articulation is course evaluation one time, applied many times. It involves faculty evaluation of course comparability, done by evaluating the content or SLOs. These will be applied through review of military transcripts, external exams, and industry-recognized credentials. Student evaluation is more time-intensive. This is a one-time evaluation done by discipline faculty to evaluate each individual student; a grade is awarded after evaluation of a student's mastery of course content or SLOs. This applies to credit by exam and portfolio review. There are 359 students district-wide who are eligible to get military credit this spring 2022 semester. In contrast, we received only 76 petitions for credit by exam in the past four years. Articulation works better for military credit evaluation; we won't have to evaluate each student. The numbers for credit by exam are more manageable for student evaluation.

Each community college district shall adopt and publish policies pertaining to CPL. We already did this in Fall 2020 (BP 6.18 and AP 16.18.1). Discipline faculty will solely determine the nature and content of the assessments. Colleges shall use the credit recommendations of the American Council on Education (ACE). ACE is an organization that has existed for more than 100 years. It has been integral to forming the GI Bill both for World War II and for 9/11. ACE houses two databases: one for military occupations and the other for industry standards. They hire discipline faculty from all over the country; these faculty work in teams to evaluate occupations and determine college credit. Credit can be applied to IGETC, CSU GE Breadth, local community college GEs, or requirements for a student's chosen program. CPL must be tied to a course so that faculty can assess prior learning per a course's SLOs. Grading follows the college's regular grading system; students have the option for Pass/No Pass grading if this option is available for the course. Last semester, the District Curriculum Committee worked on a project with discipline faculty to review AP and CLEP exams and assign courses to exams. Almost all of our exams have now been evaluated and this information will be posted in next year's catalog.

Students' academic records will be clearly annotated to reflect CPL; this makes it easier for CSUs to review the credit. Students who are interested in CPL, e.g., students who are active members of the Armed Forces or veterans, students who hold industry-recognized credentials or who request credit for a course based on prior learning, shall complete a Student Education Plan and be referred to the appropriate authority for assessment for prior learning. Students will complete their SEPs with a counselor and plan their CPL into the SEP. This is a requirement for veterans' certifying officials to review for benefits. Policies for assessment shall offer students an opportunity to accept, decline, or appeal decisions. For example, if a student did credit by exam and failed the exam, they have the opportunity to decline the credit by exam results. They can then take needed class; the failure in the credit by exam does not affect their GPA.

CPL and Transfer do not apply at UCs. UCs do accept CPL right now but they do not accept CPL for transfer. If a student veteran were to go to a UC campus, they will follow the UC process to have their CPL applied.

The CSU system updated their CPL policy to require CSUs to allow CPL credit for pass-along. They have worked alongside community colleges to ensure a smooth transfer for students. Credit should first be applied to CSU GE Breadth, IGETC, local GE or major requirements before it can be applied for elective credit. CSU faculty consider ACE's credit recommendations in their assessments. As we see how CSUs articulate CPL, we can begin to mimic what they are doing to help us fill out our database across the State.

There is a CPL Faculty Workgroup that will start in Fall 2022. Each college should provide one CPL faculty to work with Marianne and Chris Walker. This will be a two-year academic term from Fall 2022 to Spring 2024. The workgroup will be involved in training discipline faculty on the evaluation process and ACE recommendations. The group will also coordinate the cross-walking of college curriculum with CPL assessment methods. The District Curriculum Committee is working on developing a CPL screen in

CurricUNET to record the cross-walk information on which kinds of assessments can be used on any given course. This will eventually land at the catalog level and counselors and students will be able to see the information. It would be good to have people in the group who have a connection with veterans. CTE faculty who already work with CPL will also be good members. Marsha would like to be part of the workgroup. Marianne has an email out to Marsha to talk about the latter's involvement. Marsha can get involved in either the faculty group or through the CPL planning group.

How is CPL applied? Marianne replied that it applies to GE's whether CSU Breadth, IGETC, or local associate's, as well as major courses. She gave the example of a student veteran who turns in their discharge papers (DD214). From this, we can award 6 units of elective credit plus Area E or PE requirements. Basically, CPL is about moving people forward so they are not delayed by repeating coursework.

Chris Smith asked about industry-recognized credentials. Marianne replied that we have standards like licenses and certificates. Recognized credentials could refer to other things like Google and Quickbooks and other technology companies that offer their own training courses. There are also organizations that offer micro credentials and badges where one can complete modules with organizations that do industry training. Marianne has seen transcripts from organizations where students who don't go to college right away might take some online business classes, e.g., spreadsheets, and students get micro credentials for completing modules, leading up to a badge. Chris Smith shared that there is something similar in biotechnology. Students earn the micro credentials for a particular industry, having accomplished certain tasks, and this makes them more employable. They are called employability milestones. Chris Smith asked what if a student earned credentials from different classes, e.g., from BIOL, MATH, or other fields to apply for credit in some industry. What happens if the student might have covered part of the material in a class but not the entire content? Marianne replied that they still need to work out details. The ACE website has some articulation information.

Chris asked about the expectations from people who will be involved in CPL, e.g., how much time will they need to put in, how does this fit in with their responsibilities and contract, and how are faculty paid? Aaron replied that the new collective bargaining agreement covers the concept of professional responsibilities plan development. Faculty can put in CPL work in their PRPs and the district will figure out costs.

Marsha pointed out that JST or ACE transcripts might indicate that a course qualifies for lower division and they have their own course. For every item, does there need to be an equivalent course to get the credit and it cannot be elective credit? Marianne confirmed that elective credit is the last thing we want to award, although credit could be used for students who wind up being short; it can be applied where the student needs it.

Mike thanked Marianne Beck for her work on CPL. Madeline Wiest has also been helping out. The Chair asked if there is available data on the numbers for military learning, external exams, and others. Marianne is working on collecting data. There will be an impact on things. It took 2-3 years to get this into course outlines.

The Chair encouraged the committee members to put the word out that we need faculty for the CPL Work Group.

- Curriculum Handbook  
Curriculum Committee members had homework to review the Curriculum Handbook on their own. Some people emailed the Chair with questions and comments. He will choose two small sections of the handbook to present to the committee for discussion, and we will write the edits in. He presented an overview of the handbook, then screen-shared the section on Duties and Responsibilities for discussions and edits. There are four bullet points that show the general things that committee members do, but these are very broad. Are there other things that we can add to the list, or can we flesh out the bullets a little bit more? The committee was divided into groups to talk about how they perceive their roles and responsibilities and if they had anything to add to the list. After the entire committee reconvened from the breakout sessions,

further edits were made to the list. The Chair thinks of roles and responsibilities as similar to SLOs; they are broad. Detailed information can be found elsewhere.

Julieth Benitez, Instructional Designer, asked about the word “classification” in bullet #3. What does it refer to? It would be good to have a definition. Mike said the reference is to codes, i.e., there are codes for subject areas or codes for course titles to classify where classes fall under buckets. Lale thinks of it as a lower division-upper division thing.

After deliberations, the committee came up with the following:

- Carry on a regular review of the college curriculum.
- Consider for recommendation proposals for new courses and programs.
- Consider for recommendation all deletions, classifications, and changes in courses and programs, **as well as curricular related policies and mandates.**
- Inform faculty and oversee adherence to curricular aspects of the Education Code.
- **Ensure the creation of equitable and culturally-responsive curriculum.**
- ***Modality of courses?***

The last bullet on modality of courses has a question mark. As we go through reviewing the Curriculum Handbook, we might realize that this should be covered in another section.

The committee had a brief discussion on membership. The Instructional Designer is a voting member; the Distance Education Coordinator is non-voting. The Instructional Support Assistant was added as a non-voting member. Do we need another representative from ASLT since Ron Andrade has left the committee? Matt Montgomery is the other ASLT rep. Mike pointed out that ASLT is a small division with very few full-time faculty and it might prove a challenge to sustain having two members. The Instructional Designers are under ASLT. Matt added that he is on the committee representing the Library, to look into resources needed for courses. Resource review is part of the curriculum review and approval process and library representation is needed. The Chair will check Academic Senate bylaws for guidance on Curriculum Committee membership. Mike suggested looking at committee members’ roles. ASLT is evolving. They will get one additional Librarian. The Professional Development Coordinator is also under ASLT. How do we want the representation? The membership info only indicates two members from each division, without specifying certain faculty or their roles. The committee will hold a review of its membership at the next meeting. The Chair will circle back with Tarana on ASLT representation, and will also bring this up in Academic Senate.

Other Discussions:

Beth LaRochelle asked if the committee will continue to meet virtually the rest of the spring semester. How about in fall? The Chair replied that we will continue to meet by Zoom this spring, but we don’t yet know about fall. The Board still has options for online meetings, and we will follow their lead. They have lawyers who advise on Brown Act compliance.

**Meeting adjourned at 4:04 p.m.**