College of San Mateo

Curriculum Committee

March 24, 2022 (2:15 p.m.)

https://smccd.zoom.us/j/83977462080?pwd=eFRJV3ZlYTd3ejhsdjdqR2xVODJmdz09

MINUTES

<u>Members Present</u>
Chair	Christopher Walker
Business/Technology	Mounjed Moussalem
Creative Arts & Social Science	Jeremy Ball
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	Martin Bednarek

<u>Non-Voting Members</u>

Mike Holtzclaw, Marsha Ramezane, Alma Gomez

<u>Absent/Excused</u>
Business/Technology	Lale Yurtseven
Creative Arts & Social Science	Judith Hunt
Non-Voting Member	Ada Delaplaine
Student Services	Alex Guiriba
ASCSM Student Representative	Brittany Arriharan

<u>Other Attendees</u>

Teresa Morris, Madeline Wiest

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

Motion by Martin Bednarek to approve the revised agenda, seconded by Matt Montgomery, all members voting "Aye." The Chair moved ACTG 106 from consent to substantive agenda.

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 Modification**
  ACTG 106 Accounting Cycle Survey (1) – ***approved***. *Motion by Martin Bednarek, seconded by Chris Smith, all members voting "Aye."*
  (DE update; 2-year update; text update)
  This course was moved from consent to substantive to address Julieth Benitez's comment on SLOs and assignments. There is one SLO that is repeated in all the ACTG courses, with the only change being the topic: "Using the proper formats, perform the calculations and explain the steps to solve [topic]." Julieth wants to know if there are any additional assignments that target this SLO with regards to students performing certain skills. Are SLOs being targeted with the essays and readings in the assignments of ACTG courses that have a similar set-up?

She wanted clarification since there were some courses that had different assignments. The SLO talks about calculations; how is this targeted in the assignments and essays? Rosemary Nurre explained that they decided to standardize their SLOs a few years ago. Much of their curriculum needed to go into more depth on particular topics. Everything they do in class revolves around numerical calculations, including the preparation and understanding of financial statements. They basically use similar calculations regardless of the class, e.g., time value of money or calculation of expenses and revenue. Students try to analyze and understand what those numbers mean. This is common across the Accounting curriculum. Any essays that students write would most likely be an analysis of the calculation, or the calculation itself to support a conclusion in the essay. It's relevant to include the calculations in the essay. One example would be a question on depreciation. Students need to explain what they are depreciating and why they are depreciating that asset. There are different types of calculations for depreciation and students should be able to explain why they would choose one method over another. Many, but not all of the entries would require some kind of calculation and explanation.

The Chair commented that in Math, their SLOs are very calculation-oriented and are assessed based on testing, but he sees Rosemary's point that Accounting students show competency with the calculations in their essays.

Action Items

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

- **Approval of Minutes from the March 10, 2022 meeting**

- **Course Modifications**
  ACTG 103   Ten-Key Skills (.5)
                (DE update; 2-year update; text update)
  ACTG 107   Time Value of Money Survey (1)
                (DE update; 2-year update)
  ACTG 108   Financial Statement Analysis Survey (1)
                (DE update; 2-year update; change in text)
  ACTG 118   Personal Investing (3)
                (DE update; 2-year update; change in text)
  ACTG 121   Financial Accounting (4)
                (DE update; 2-year update; change in texts)
  ACTG 131   Managerial Accounting (4)
                (DE update; 2-year update; change in texts)
  ACTG 144   Quickbooks: Set-Up and Service Business (1.5)
                (DE update; 2-year update)
  ACTG 145   Quickbooks: Payroll and Merchandising Business (1.5)
                (DE update; 2-year update)
  ACTG 161   Intermediate Accounting I (4)
                (DE update; 2-year update)
  ACTG 162   Intermediate Accounting II (4)
                (DE update; 2-year update)
  ACTG 163   Auditing (3)
                (DE update; 2-year update; changes in texts)
  ACTG 164   Governmental & Nonprofit Accounting (3)
                (DE update; 2-year update; text update)
  ACTG 165   Cost Accounting (3)
                (DE update; 2-year update)
  ACTG 167   Advanced Accounting (4)

(DE update; 2-year update)

ACTG 168 Financial Management for Accountants (3)
(DE update; 2-year update; text update)

ACTG 169 Accounting Ethics (3)
(DE update; 2-year update; text update)

ACTG 175 Volunteer Income Tax Preparation (2.5)
(DE update; 2-year update; change in texts)

ACTG 176 Enrolled Agent Exam Preparation (3)
(DE update; 2-year update; text update)

ACTG 181 Taxation of Individuals Using Tax Software (4)
(DE update; 2-year update; text update)

ACTG 182 Taxation of Business Entities Using Tax Software (4)
(DE update; 2-year update; text update)

ACTG 183 Taxation of Trusts, Gifts, and Estates Using Tax Software (2)
(2-year update; text update)

ACTG 262 Depreciation, Business & Repair Expenses (.5)
(2-year update)

ACTG 263 Sole Proprietorships (.5)
(2-year update)

ACTG 264 Lacerte Tax Software Basics (.5)
(2-year update)

ACTG 265 Taxation of Rental Real Estate (1)
(2-year update)

ACTG 276 VITA Intermediate (1)
(2-year update; changes in texts)

ACTG 277 VITA Advanced (1)
(2-year update; text update)

ACTG 278 VITA Supervisory (1)
(2-year update; text update)

ACTG 665MB Taxation and Employee Stock Options (.5)
(2-year update)

ACTG 665MC The Retired Taxpayer (1)
(2-year update)

ACTG 665ME Electronic Tax Research (.5)
(2-year update)

ACTG 665MH Foreclosures & Debt Cancellation (.5)
(2-year update)

ACTG 665MJ Employee Business Expenses (.5)
(2-year update)

ACTG 665MK Taxation of Investments (.5)
(2-year update)

ACTG 665ML Taxation of Net Operating Losses (.5)
(2-year update)

ACTG 665MM IRS Reporting for Nonprofits (.5)
(2-year update)

ACTG 665MO Tax Update & Ethics (.5)
(2-year update)

ACTG 665MQ Estate Taxation Update (.5)
(2-year update)

ACTG 665MR Tax Practice and Procedure (.5)
(DE update; 2-year update; text update)

ACTG 665MS Tax Controversies and Client Representation (.5)
(2-year update; text update)

ACTG 665MT Preparing Form 706 Estate Tax Return (.5)

(2-year update)

ACTG   665MU   Foreign Tax Credit (.5)
                   (2-year update; text update)

ACTG   665MV   Foreign Account & Asset Tax Reporting (.5)
                   (DE update; 2-year update; text update)

ACTG   665MW   IRS Representation & Ethics (.5)
                   (DE update; 2-year update)

DENT   701   Dental Science I (3)
                   (DE update; text update)

DENT   702   Dental Science II (3)
                   (DE update; 2-year update; text update)

DENT   703   Allied Health Communication (1)
                   (DE update; 2-year update; change in texts)

DENT   721   Dental Materials I (3)
                   (DE update; 2-year update; changes in content and texts)

DENT   722   Dental Materials II (2)
                   (DE update; 2-year update; change in content; text update)

DENT   730   Occupational Safety and Infection Control in Dentistry (1.5)
                   (DE update; 2-year update; change in content; text update)

DENT   740   Chairside Assisting I (3)
                   (DE update; 2-year update; change in content; text update)

DENT   742   Chairside Assisting II (3)
                   (DE update; 2-year update; change in content; text update)

DENT   753   Dental Assisting Clinical Practice (5)
                   (DE update; 2-year update; change in evaluation; text update)

DENT   763   Dental Radiology (2)
                   (DE update; 2-year update; change in content; text update)

KINE   200   Yoga History and Culture (3)
                   (New DE Supplement; 2-year update; changes in frequently recommended preparation and texts)

KINE   202   Yoga Asana Studies (3)
                   (New DE Supplement; 2-year update; changes in title, description, and texts)

SOCI   110   Courtship, Marriage and the Family (3)
                   (6-year update; change in texts)

SOCI   141   Race and Ethnic Relations (3)
                   (6-year update; change in texts)

- **Course Deactivation**
  READ   830   College and Career Reading

- **Program Modification**
  - Building Inspection – Certificate of Achievement (Changes in selective courses)

- **ENGL Memo**
  - Memo re prerequisites and/or recommended preparation for ENGL 100 and ENGL 105

Open Agenda

- Curriculum Handbook

  The committee had a robust discussion on membership and composition. At the last meeting, we had talked about edits to the list of voting members. The Chair had had conversations with some folks afterwards, and the list is being brought up to see if the committee might want to consider a different version.

  One issue revolves around ASLT members. The list shows two voting members from ASLT, with the

Instructional Designer being called out separately. The Instructional Designers are non-teaching faculty housed under ASLT and they play an important role in curriculum design. In the Chair's discussions outside Curriculum Committee, someone had commented that technically, this would mean that ASLT would have three voting members, which is more than what other divisions have, and which is a lot for a very small division. Matt Montgomery stated that Academic Senate bylaws indicate that the Librarian and one other ASLT faculty should be on the committee. This came about because at some point, Library Services had not been housed in a division, but had been directly under the VPI. The bylaws would ensure that Librarians would be represented regardless of what division they may fall under in case of future reorganization. This also holds true for the Instructional Designer. The downside to all this is that calling out the Librarian and the Instructional Designer would mean that they will always be the only two representatives from ASLT.

Julieth shared that she had had a conversation with Teresa Morris, Academic Senate Co-President and former Curriculum Committee Chair, and Teresa had pointed out that the Library faculty and the Instructional Designer represent fields of expertise; they don't necessarily represent the division. Teresa thinks it makes sense to have those two members, plus additional faculty members from ASLT.

Mike Holtzclaw, Vice President of Instruction, is concerned that ASLT is the smallest division in terms of faculty and could run into problems with filing up Curriculum Committee membership. We have to consider the new point system and the 10+1 roles that faculty have to play. Librarians and Instructional Designers will also be called upon to serve on other campus committees including for hiring and tenure evaluations, and this will spread ASLT faculty thin. Also, if we specify that ASLT members would be a Librarian and an Instructional Designer, this closes the door to other ASLT staff. We will soon have a Professional Development Coordinator who will also be under ASLT. Would this mean that this person cannot sit in Curriculum Committee?

Teresa shared some historical context. Academic Senate revised its bylaws some years ago and there were changes in committee representation by division. One offshoot was the calling out of Library faculty to have a voice since they were not part of any division, as Matt had pointed out earlier. In 2020, when we hired an Instructional Designer, Teresa knew that Curriculum Committee would need this kind of expertise. There had already been a previous precedent and that was when library expertise was called for in the committee. Academic Senate bylaws call for Library representation in the Senate and in Curriculum Committee, but not on any other committees. As a sub-committee of Academic Senate, the Curriculum Committee follows AS bylaws, including the regulations about having two representatives from each division, but it is possible to ask for something different for the Curriculum Committee. There are differences between Curriculum Committee and Academic Senate; curriculum needs voices and expertise at the same time. While faculty voice is important in Senate, Curriculum Committee is different because this committee has business to do and, in Teresa's opinion, the expertise of Librarians and Instructional Designers is needed. In addition, Title 5 calls for the review of library and learning resources for courses.

Chris Smith appreciates the fact that expertise is being called out in Curriculum Committee, but he believes that committee members can serve double duty, i.e., the Instructional Designer or Librarian can also represent the ASLT division, like he represents his division. He thinks that like with other divisions, ASLT can have two voices but do we define who those two will be?

The Chair reminded the group that there are other members of the group with specialized tasks, like the Articulation Officer, and the SLO and Distance Education Coordinators who are non-voting members. If we have three members from ASLT, maybe one of them could be a non-voting member?

Teresa pointed that whether or not one of the members from ASLT is ex-oficio or non-voting, it would still mean having three people from the division. She added that Instructional Designers, like Librarians, cover the whole curriculum, not just that of a single division and can be perceived as not favoring any one area. They see the campus view in a way that other members, e.g., from Language Arts or Counseling don't see. For example, as Library faculty, her role had been to help people understand the impact on resources and what can and cannot be supported, and this did not necessarily mean she was representing a voice for ASLT.

Mike understands the idea of representation both in terms of an individual's expertise and of division expertise. He recommended working in language in the bylaws that ASLT representatives would be a Librarian and an Instructional Designer, but if ASLT grows and there's a vote or desire to have some other representation from ASLT, we can add members who can be either voting or non-voting. In case there are organizational changes and the Librarian or the ID come to fall under another division, they will continue to be represented in Curriculum Committee. The Chair suggested that maybe ASLT can have two faculty representatives and separately, make sure we have an Instructional Designer on the committee. If the ID is one of ASLT's reps, they have voting rights; if ASLT decides they want different faculty representation, then the Instructional Designer would remain on the committee but as a non-voting member.

Mike is worried about stretching faculty too thin and he likes the concept of faculty in Curriculum Committee doing double duty. In a sense, division reps are already doing this. For example, Chris Smith has a discipline expertise of Biology but he's also in Curriculum Committee to be a representative and liaison for his division, bringing back curriculum matters in other disciplines to his discipline and division. While each division cannot have its own Instructional Designer, the two IDs are assigned specific divisions, e.g., the contact for Math and Science in Jennifer Howze-Owens.

The group discussed different permutations to work around the issue, including members having dual roles and ASLT having three members, two of whom will be voting and the other non-voting. Teresa commented that she would not be comfortable with the Librarian being a non-voting member. She reminded the group that there is Title 5 language on representation for library and learning resources review of curriculum including digital and print resources and tutoring available to support a course. For example, if a course on brain surgery is proposed, they could say that the course cannot be supported because we don't have the available infrastructure like labs, or other resources to support the course. In response to Chris Smith's question, Teresa stated that Title 5 doesn't specify that Librarians will be voting members.

Mike suggested adding language in Academic Senate bylaws that divisional reorganization should trigger an automatic review of representation. Teresa thinks that there is some trigger language in the bylaws around division representation, based on how many faculty a division has. There is a tipping point and a threshold for having one, two, or three representatives from a division.

The Chair recalled that a few years ago, when IDST 110 College 1 had been proposed, the only representative from ASLT at that time had been the Librarian, and we had later revised the committee composition to add an additional ASLT member and that was when Ron Andrade had come onboard. He will hold further discussions with Teresa and Arielle Smith, Academic Senate Co-Presidents, and bring a proposal back to Curriculum Committee. If the committee approves a different composition, he will bring it up with Academic Senate.

Moving on down the sections of the Curriculum Handbook, the Chair noted that there are sections of the handbook that look unfinished. The committee was divided into groups to flesh out some sections on roles and responsibilities and what they actually do in Curriculum Committee throughout the year. Academic Senate did something similar a couple of years ago where they went and defined the roles of members.

Jeremy Ball asked about the CurricUNET workflow. Is this defined by what's already in CurricUNET or is the workflow something that we put in CurricUNET? The Chair replied that somewhere down in the handbook document, there is information on technical review and it calls out the people involved at different stages of the process, e.g., when the division reps, the Curriculum and Instructional Systems Specialist, DE Coordinator, and the Chair, etc. get involved.

Julieth pointed out that her and Donna Eyestone's roles in Curriculum Committee are more particular in how they approach course review. The Chair said that we can make a separate list for the roles of specific persons, e.g., the ID, SLO and DE Coordinators. Julieth had a follow up question: if we separate out certain roles, e.g., the DE Coordinator reviews the DE addendum, do other people look at this, too? The Chair

replied that two years ago when the committee reviewed a ton of proposals with new DE supplements, it looked like the committee was reviewing the DEs, but he doesn't know if this is something that we can continue to do in-depth, or if it's something that would be more of the purview of the DE Coordinator. For now, he will put a question mark on the general roles and responsibilities with the possibility that the review of DE addendums will be moved to the roles of the DE Coordinator. He is thinking that maybe all committee members can review all parts of the course outline, but maybe not look at the DE supplements in as much detail as the DE Coordinator would. He will reach out to some individuals with specific roles in the committee to work out a small list of their roles and responsibilities.

Jeremy brought up a point that since committee members are in the job of approving or denying proposals, that members have some familiarity with basic Title 5 regulations or C-IDs. He thinks that most members pick up information incidentally, without formal training. Is there an expectation that reps know these things? And what about the roles of the VPI and others with advising positions? The Chair replied that we don't really do formal training, aside from the first meeting in fall where the Chair goes over some things. Mike added that committee members are not expected to know all this, but some familiarity would be helpful. As VPI, his role is to check on some things along with other folks on the committee, but he doesn't have Title 5 memorized either.

The committee came up with the following roles and responsibilities for Division Curriculum Representatives:

- Review course outlines at various stages of the development process
- Serve as a guide for curriculum for your division
- Liaison to the division and represent the perspectives of the division
- Attend and participate in semi-monthly curriculum meetings
- Serve as support for other faculty members through the course writing process
- Determine if courses meet various proposed academic requirements – such as discipline assignments, degree applicability, general education, etc.
- Review DE addendums (maybe DE Coordinator?)
- Maintain familiarity with related laws and regulations surrounding curriculum

Meeting adjourned at 4:01 p.m.