

# College of San Mateo

Curriculum Committee

April 28, 2022 (2:15 p.m.)

<https://smccd.zoom.us/j/82784654697?pwd=aG9mVW9pbkQ5ck00NHRhS1JvOWpXQT09>

## MINUTES

### Members Present

Chair	Christopher Walker
Business/Technology	Mounjed Moussalem
Creative Arts & Social Science	Jeremy Ball, Judith Hunt
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	Lale Yurtseven
Distance Education	Donna Eyestone
Student Services	Martin Bednarek
ASCSM Student Representative	Brittany Arriharan

### Other Attendees

Krys Bobrowksi, Madeline Wiest

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

Motion by Chris Smith to approve the agenda, seconded by Judith Hunt, all members voting "Aye." Chris Smith had a topic to add to the agenda, but we will cover this in the next meeting.

### **Discussion – as an Open Agenda Item**

- Discussion of ENGL and ESL 400 as recommended preparation: Removal of the old frequently recommended preparation of "Eligibility for ENGL 838 or ENGL 848 or ESL 400" and replacement with "Completion of or concurrent enrollment in ENGL 100 or ENGL 105". – **approved**. Motion by Jeremy Ball, seconded by Chris Smith; one abstention: Judith Hunt; other members voting "Aye."

Due to AB 705, the English Department banked below transfer level courses including ENGL 838 and ENGL 848 which are frequently recommended preparation for a variety of course offerings. Since these courses are no longer offered, it is best to remove references to them in the catalog, starting with updating the course outlines in CurricUNET. There is a memo in the consent agenda about removing the frequently recommended preparation of Eligibility for ENGL 838 and ENGL 848 from a list of courses. In CurricUNET, the frequently recommended preparation for many courses is listed as Eligibility for ENGL 838 or ENGL 848 or ESL 400, with all three included in one check box. However, ESL 400, which is similar in level to the two banked ENGL courses, is still active. Do we also want to remove references to ESL 400 in the recommended preparation or leave this in? It might be confusing for students to have language only referencing ESL 400, e.g., a student might wonder why an ART or BIOL course has an ESL recommended prep. We have been cleaning up courses when they come through as CurricUNET

proposals, but there are some that have not been updated and thus still have the old recommended preparation. We also have to consider other factors including district alignment and the level of preparation of students entering a particular course that used to have the frequently recommended preparation. It is the hope and expectation that students are ready to do college level reading and writing.

Evan Kaiser dropped some language in Chat that could be used to replace the old recommended preparation: "Appropriate skill level as indicated by high school GPA, completion of ESL 400, or other measures as applicable. Students eligible for English 100 who would prefer to receive extra support in reading and writing skills may enroll in English 105." Chris Smith noted that changing the recommended preparation language to allude to high school GPA may be okay for students who graduated from high school, assuming that they have the needed skills to succeed in college classes with the English skills they have. How about students who maybe did not graduate from high school, or who feel that they don't have the right English skills? He believes that faculty should decide what statement they want to put in place to replace the language on ENGL 838 and 848. It would be most helpful if faculty were provided guidance on what to write in.

The Chair reminded the group that AB 705's intent is for students to not have to repeat courses or academic topics they have already covered in high school. There may be more harm in holding students back than in accelerating them to the next level, although we also don't want to have students sign up for a class they are not adequately prepared for in terms of English competency.

The Chair asked if from a counseling perspective, Counselors steer students away from certain classes in their first semesters because they think that students are not ready for a certain class. Alex Guiriba replied that it's a case-by-case basis, but they definitely look at how prepared and comfortable students are for classes. Students are encouraged to get into ENGL 100 or 105 in their first year.

Evan suggested alternative language to put in as frequently recommended preparation: "Completion of or concurrent enrollment in ENGL 100 or ENGL 105." Jeremy Ball considers this good replacement language; faculty can opt out of it if they want to. Chris Smith asked if making this change would be considered a minor or a major change, which would affect the way the proposal would go into the agenda, whether consent or substantive. The Chair believes that it would be considered a minor change, since the proposals already have an existing recommended preparation. We are just changing the language, not removing the fact that faculty wanted recommended prep related to reading and writing to begin with.

The Office of the VPI can manually remove references to ENGL 838 and 848 from CurricUNET and add in the new language. A question was raised on whether it makes more sense to have faculty do it instead of asking the VPIO to do it. And do we need to get faculty's approval first? This could be time-consuming, and we only have one meeting left for this school year. The group decided that we can go ahead and remove the references to ENGL 838, ENGL 848, and ESL 400 and replace it with Evan's suggested language. The Chair will email faculty as an advisory to let them know what the committee has decided. Faculty can update this when they submit their courses for approval in future curriculum cycles; they can change or raise the standards as they deem fit. The general consensus is that we do need to have recommended preparation language in course outlines so that students are aware that there are certain expectations of them. We can add generic language for the justification for the recommended preparation.

Mounjed raised the issue of having recommended preparation on higher level CIS courses that have prerequisites. Wouldn't the frequently recommended prep language already have been fulfilled in the lower CIS courses? Ada replied that this may just be due to faculty checking the Frequently Recommended Preparation box in CurricUNET without considering that the course was a successive level course in a sequence.

## Action Items

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

- **Brown Act Resolution for April 2022**
- **Approval of Minutes from the March 24, 2022 meeting**
- **Technical Memos**
  - Memo to remove references to ENGL 838, ENGL 848, and READ as recommended preparation for courses
  - Memo to update programs affected by title changes of some courses
  - Memo to bank experimental courses
- **Course Modifications**

HIST	261	Women in American History I (3)	(DE update; change in content; typo correction in assignments)
NURS	211	Introduction to Nursing (4.5)	(2-year update; change in texts)
NURS	221	Pediatric Nursing (4.5)	(2-year update; changes in assignments and texts)
NURS	225	Nursing Skills Lab II (.5)	(2-year update)
NURS	242	Leadership/Management in Nursing (5)	(2-year update)
NURS	666	Career Exploration in Nursing (1)	(DE update; 2-year update; changes in objectives and evaluation)
NURS	817	Open Lab for Nursing 221/222 (.5)	(2-year update; change in texts)
NURS	819	Open Lab for Nursing 241/242 (.5)	(2-year update; change in texts)
- **Course Deactivations**

ACTG	680MF	IFRS Survey I
ACTG	680MG	IFRS Survey II
AJPS	112	Dispatch Academy
FIRE	680MD	Fire Academy Preparation
FIRE	680ME	Firefighter Academy
FIRE	793	Firefighter I Academy
- **Program Modification**
  - Electrical Technology: Electrical Power Systems and Instrumentation – Certificate of Achievement (Addition of program description and change in units due to a unit change for ELEC 232)
- **Program Deactivation**
  - Group Fitness Instructor – 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.*

- **New Programs**

- Music and Technology – Associate in Arts Degree (23 units) – **approved**. Motion by Chris Smith, seconded by Jeremy Ball, all members voting “Aye”.
- Music and Technology – Certificate of Achievement (23 units) – **approved**. Motion by Jeremy Ball, seconded by Chris Smith, all members voting “Aye”.

The college has had an Electronic Music program for a long time, and this is fairly heavy on the Music side although it is a hybrid of a number of things. For some time, people interested in Electronic Music had to take a fair amount of Music theory. The two new Music programs are being proposed in response to a push from the State to incorporate more technology into Music programs. The Music Department is incorporating courses that could be considered Music Industry or Commercial Music, e.g., Music Business, Songwriting, and an audio engineering-based recording class. They wanted to create open-ended programs with recommended options or electives based on students’ interests. This is considered as a career degree. Some of the Music students already have previous degrees and are just seeking to expand their skills sets. Committee members expressed their appreciation for the way the programs were presented, with the recommended course electives for students with specific interests laid out very clearly. The Chair suggested that Kryz Bobrowski contact the folks in charge of program mapping so these programs can be mapped out.

#### **Open Agenda**

- Curriculum Handbook Discussion

Membership: - **approved**. Motion by Chris Smith, seconded by Jeremy Ball, all members voting “Aye”.

The Chair presented a summary of the membership composition as discussed in previous meetings. He organized the composition to show two columns on the list, the voting members with the two representatives per division under the left column, and non-voting members under the other column, divided into Administrative Consultants and Faculty Consultants. The SLO and Distance Education Coordinators are called out, along with the Instructional Designer and Librarian under Non-Voting Members/Faculty Consultants. There is additional language specifying that Non-Voting Members/Faculty Consultants may also be chosen as voting members for their division, which may be the likely scenario for the Librarian and Instructional Designer, but this is left open to the division.

Matt Montgomery reminded the group that we have to consider the point system and asked how this would work for Curriculum Committee membership. The Chair pointed out that Curriculum Committee participation is worth 3 points. The SLO and DE Coordinators don’t get points; they get reassigned time instead. They are not required to attend Curriculum Committee meetings; their work is usually done at the back end, in technical review. In his discussions with former Curriculum Committee Chair and current Academic Senate Co-President Teresa Morris, Teresa had suggested working language into the Academic Senate bylaws that any rearrangement of divisions will automatically trigger a reassessment of membership. The Chair will present our proposed committee composition to Academic Senate for discussion/approval.

<p><b>Voting Members</b></p> <p>2 members from Business/Technology Division</p> <p>2 members from Counseling Division</p> <p>2 members from Creative Arts/Social Science Division</p> <p>2 members from Language Arts Division</p> <p>2 members from Math/Science Division</p> <p>2 members from Kinesiology, Athletics and Dance Division</p> <p><del>1 member from Library</del></p> <p><b>2 members from Academic Support/Learning Technology Division</b></p> <p>ASCSM student representative</p> <p>Chair</p>	<p><b><u>Non Voting Members – Administrative Consultants</u></b></p> <p>Curriculum and Instructional Systems Specialist - Instruction Office</p> <p><b>Instructional Support Assistant – Instruction Office</b></p> <p>Vice President of Instruction</p> <p>Registrar</p> <p>Articulation Officer</p> <p><b><u>Non Voting Members – Faculty Consultants</u></b></p> <p>Student Learning Outcomes Coordinator</p> <p><b>Distance Education Coordinator</b></p> <p><b>An Instructional Designer</b></p> <p><b>A Librarian</b></p>
--	---

Faculty who serve in a **Non Voting Member – Faculty Consultant** role may also be chosen as a voting member from their division.

The Chair divided the group into little meeting sessions to discuss general guidance and typical comments for sections of the course outlines: Catalog Course Description, SLOs, Course Objectives, Lecture/Lab Content, Prerequisites/Corequisites and Recommended Preparation, Instructional Methods, and Methods of Evaluation. How would committee members advise faculty who are working on the different sections of the course outline?

After reconvening, the following points were discussed:

Room 1: Catalog Description, SLOs, and Course Objectives, with Jeremy Ball, Alex Guiriba, Judith Hunt, and David Laderman:

- For accreditation purposes, SLOs should not be the same as course objectives. They are related but objectives are more of aspirational goals for teaching. SLOs are more concrete and precise and measurable for students; they are our takeaways for students.
- For catalog course descriptions, common comments in the past included that some descriptions are too wordy, with extraneous information. We should remember that we are not writing the descriptions for other faculty or colleagues or the accreditation committees; we should write the descriptions with students in mind. There should be standards, e.g., grammatical consistency, use present tense, use active voice, etc.
- The group also discussed having a condensed calendar, to which Mike Holtzclaw, Vice President of Instruction responded that we are working on this. There is a District Task Force looking into this. The Chair commented that it is hard to imagine the kind of work that would go into converting everything into a quarter system.

Room 2: Course Lecture/Lab Content, Prerequisites/Corequisites, and Recommended Preparation, with Ada Delaplaine, Evan Kaiser, Beth LaRochelle, Mounjed Moussalem

- The process for determining prerequisites and recommended preparation should start with the department - to get department consensus on what skills are required in a course, keeping in mind the spirit of AB 705, including not making any hard prerequisites if they are not needed.
- Consider alignment with sister colleges in the district, as well as with professional organizations.

Also, consider if course content aligns with the outcomes. The district has different combinations, e.g., there are differences in the ESL course offerings across the three campuses, and Evan would like to know more about the pedagogical rationale or history behind these.

- Pyramid of skills and cognitive skills examples for the course content versus lab content portions of a course, including the use of words and verbs like “understand” versus “demonstrate”. We should use verbs that capture what students are doing or what students will be able to do upon completion of the course. Usually, lab content is in alignment with course content or complements the concepts being taught.

Chris Smith commented that a number of our courses are tied to C-IDs and we have to meet those requirements at the very minimum for lecture and lab content.

Room 3: Representative Instructional Methods, Assignments, and Methods of Evaluation, with Julieth Diaz Benitez, Chris Smith, Shana Young

- The group had conversations on how to achieve balance between not being too prescriptive and giving people room for flexibility, as well as providing guidelines in terms of what is expected in certain sections of the course outline. How much detail should be presented? For example, assignments should show a variety of options on what can be done in this class, i.e., list different possibilities, not necessarily just those assignments that are required.
- Ensure the use of an equity lens in course review. We can apply this to different sections of the course outline, e.g., in course design when considering the assignments or the evaluation of instructional methods. For instructional methods, there should maybe be an option for library business or interventions.
- Include a link to the handbook in the email that is sent out to faculty who will be writing proposals, e.g., to faculty in disciplines where course updates are needed. This way, people will have reference material up front.

The Chair mentioned that the Curriculum Committee Chair at Skyline is also updating their handbook and will turn the handbook into a website that can be easily organized by sections and will help faculty who write curriculum. He will meet with her to see how she is doing her version of the handbook, and maybe get some ideas. Julieth suggested putting the handbook in Canvas Shell.

There is no DE discussion on the agenda today; this is a large piece that needs deeper discussions. He will reach out to the DEAC Committee for guidance. The Chair added that it would be good to have guidance per section of the handbook, including expectations from specific sections. Maybe we can have one paragraph guidelines for each section, e.g., “We expect these types of things to be included in this section...” For example, in the methods of evaluation, we have a list of about a dozen different options with checkboxes next to them. Some of these things are very specific types of evaluation methods that some people don’t actually use in their class, e.g., Class Performance. Some faculty interpret this to mean measuring how the student performed in the class, but this is not the intent of this item; it is more for things like a theater class where there’s a performance at the end of the course. It is easy to get this wrong because there is no guidance attached to this section. The same is true for the section on representative assignments. Julieth agreed that it would help with the review process if people have more clarity on what we expect them to write in each section, along with the level of detail.

The Chair asked members to notify him at the May meeting if they will continue to serve on the committee. If they will be rotating out, we will need to know who will be coming onboard next year. Can division reps get information from their divisions? He clarified that there are no guidelines on terms; it is up to the individuals and the divisions to decide. There are members who have been on the committee for 12 years or longer. One thing to consider is that this is a technical committee; a member who has served for only one or two years is barely learning what is going on, and then they might rotate out. We have allowed people to stay on longer if they decide to do so. Mounjed Moussaem noted that experience in being a member of Curriculum Committee is very relevant. The Chair added that in the Bylaws, the Chair is voted on and replaced every two years, but we frequently vote the same person in. For example, Teresa Morris was Chair

for about 10 years and prior to that, she had been a committee member. Laura Demsetz had been Chair before Teresa and she also served multiple terms. The Chair doesn't rotate as frequently in Curriculum Committee as those in other committees do.

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