

College of San Mateo

Curriculum Committee

October 13, 2022 (2:15 p.m.)

<https://smccd.zoom.us/j/89446857918?pwd=elZ3cHpwOWFqMDI3dlhuSXZqMjJ6dz09>

MINUTES

Members Present

Chair

Academic Support and Learning Technologies

ASCSM Student Representative

Business/Technology

Creative Arts & Social Science

Instructional Design

Kinesiology Division

Language Arts Division

Student Services

Christopher Walker

Lia Thomas

Michelle Aguilar Valdovinos

Pete von Bleichert

Jeremy Ball, Judith Hunt

Julieth Benitez

Shana Young

Kat Webster

Trang Luong

Non-Voting Members

Carla Grandy, Ada Delaplaine, Marsha Ramezane

Absent/Excused

Business/Technology

Language Arts Division

Math/Science Division

Mounjed Moussalem

Robbie Baden

Beth LaRoche, Christopher Smith

Other Attendees

David Galvez, Stephen Heath, Joyce Meyer

Chair, Chris Walker called the meeting to order at 2:18 p.m. Motion by Pete von Bleichert to approve the agenda, seconded by Marsha Ramezane, all members voting "Aye."

We have the student representative, Michelle Aguilar Valdovinos, joining the meeting today. The Chair will meet with her at a later time to provide an orientation.

Consent Agenda

Marsha Ramezane, Articulation Officer, asked if the recently-approved PSCI 125 was approved for the Associate degree and GE and Jeremy Ball confirmed that it was approved for a Science GE.

Motion by Jeremy Ball to approve the consent agenda, seconded by Pete Von Bleichert, all members voting "Aye."

Motion by Lia Thomas to amend the consent agenda and move DGME 100 from the consent agenda to the substantive agenda, seconded by July Benitez, all members voting "Aye." DGME 100 will be postponed to the next meeting so questions regarding information competency SLOs can be addressed.

- **Approval of minutes from the meeting from September 8 and 22, 2022**
- **Reaffirmation of the Brown Act resolution in emergency situations**
- **Course Modifications**
 - DGME 100 Media in Society (3) – ***postponed to next meeting***
(2-year update; changes in description, SLOs, objectives, content, methods of instruction, and assignments; text update)
 - DGME 118 Digital Audio Production (3)
(DE update; 2-year update; changes in content, methods of instruction, assignments, evaluation, and texts)
 - DGME 133 Radio and Podcast Production Lab II (2)
(DE update; 2-year update; changes in title, description, content, SLOs, objectives, and text)
- **Course Deactivations**
 - ART 420 Art Internship
 - DGME 111 Dreamweaver Fundamentals

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**
 - LSKL 855 Strategies for Effective Problem Solving – Math and Beyond (.5) – **conditionally approved, pending changes in the description.** Discipline Assignment: Learning Assistance or Learning Skills Coordinators or Instructors, and Tutoring Coordinators OR Learning Disabilities: Disabled Student Programs and Services. *Motion by Marsha Ramezane, seconded by July Benitez, all members voting “Aye.”*

This course was designed to help DRC students develop some MATH strategies. Half or more of students coming into DRC think they have a MATH disability. In talking to them, Joyce Meyer realized that they don’t use effective strategies in approaching MATH and need problem-solving skills. She cited a book that came out in 1945; the methods are still being taught, but a lot of students don’t know the steps to actually solving problems. This course could help students not just in MATH but throughout their life.

The Chair, who is a MATH professor, thinks that this is a great course. He agrees that MATH is not just about Math but is about general life problem-solving. This is why MATH is a core requirement for any degree. It is not just about having skills specifically in Algebra or Geometry, but about having problem-solving skills.

Kat Webster asked if the course is AB 705-compliant. The outline states that this is not a MATH course, but it still looks like a non-credit prep course. Joyce doesn’t think the course runs counter to AB 705 as it is a strategies course, not a MATH course, and could complement AB 705. The course would be helpful not just to MATH students, but to any student who would like to acquire these kinds of skills and ways of looking at various issues. The Chair, who has been immersed in AB 705 for the past five years, believes that the way it is written, the course is not designed to be a MATH course. It has no

prerequisites and is not a prerequisite for anything else. It is a standalone course offered by DRC as an optional course. The SLOs also don't identify with teaching specific MATH skills, but more of demonstrating productive study habits, test preparation, test-taking, etc. He doesn't think that the course violates AB 705, and it does complement things that the MATH Department has been doing.

Kat personally thinks that an ENGL version of this class would be helpful, e.g., how to approach big reading assignments that intimidate students. She thinks the main problems include students' inability to pay attention; they get bored. How do we combat this and have students get over their fear that they can't handle the reading material? Joyce explained that she has used some of these same strategies to teach general learning strategies: how to break down a textbook, etc. She can go off this and build little mini-courses around various topics of subject areas. Kat will speak with other ENGL faculty and will get back to Joyce. Joyce clarified that this type of course is being offered by DRC but they do work with all students who struggle. What she has noticed is that sometimes, students might not have a learning disability at all, but just need to develop good learning strategies.

The Chair added that the MATH Department has thought about this deeply as they tried to implement AB 705. They created corequisite support courses for some MATH classes and they try to do some of these things in class, but they are constrained in terms of space and time. While they talk about these things in MATH courses, it is nice to have a standalone option. Joyce is very interested in getting input and feedback from faculty in various curricular areas so they can address those situations and concerns, since faculty don't have time to go into these learning strategies as they teach their classes.

Pete had a comment on making the description more concise as there is some repetitive language. Since students see the descriptions in the catalog, having a more concise description would be a better hook. Joyce would be happy to work on this. The Chair will work with her to clean up the description and bring it back as a memo at the next meeting. In the meantime, we can do a conditional approval and do the adjustments at the back end when we get the revised course description back.

- **Course Modification**

VARS 400 Varsity Water Polo: Men and Women (3) - *Postponed*
(6-year update; changes in title, prerequisite, description, SLOs, objectives, and methods of instruction)
Questions regarding VARS 400 will be written up and we will get them answered outside of the committee meeting since representatives cannot make it to the meeting. There had been some questions about the prerequisite language and how the prerequisite will be implemented in class.

Pete asked about the SOP for instances like this when the submitters of proposals are not available to attend meetings. Discussion on this proposal has been postponed multiple times. The Chair explained that part of the issue is that the faculty who was hired to teach this course is brand new and he is not the faculty author for the proposal. The course revision was submitted by another faculty with the help of Dean Andreas Wolf. We have been trying to invite Andreas to come to a meeting to represent this course and answer general questions about procedures and such. The Chair clarified that this is not SOP but there are certain scheduling issues that cannot be avoided. In the past, we have tried to accommodate faculty who couldn't come to meetings because

they were teaching at that time, and they have asked other faculty to represent them at the meeting.

Judith suggested engaging the new Coach regardless that he was not involved in the course modification proposal, and Shana Young said that the new Coach and Andreas might attend the next meeting. We will make one more attempt to get representatives for this Water Polo class. The Chair and Shana will try to prep the representatives on the comments made by committee members so that they will be ready to answer questions.

- **Program Modification**

- Accounting – Associate in Arts Degree: Addition of ACTG 119 as an option for the core courses – ***approved with changes to PLO #2, capitalize the word “Use”***. Motion by Pete von Bleichert, seconded by Marsha Ramezane, all members voting “Aye.”

Marsha asked if it was ever determined how ACTG 119 (Personal Financial Planning) and BUS. 113 (Personal Finance) are different. The Chair replied that he had had some conversations with Francisco Gamez, Dean of Business and Technology and it appears that the two have enough differences to be separate courses; one is focused on accounting and the other is focused on business planning.

Open Agenda

- Equity in Curriculum – David Galvez

After committee introductions, David Galvez, Director of Equity, introduced himself and spoke about his education and background. His experiences in community colleges as a student, faculty, and counselor were life-changing. During the Covid lockdowns, he had thought about where he wanted his impact to be and decided that it would be in working in a community college. He is very excited to be back in the community college.

David asked the committee where they felt they were at and which directions they want to go, and how his office can support the committee’s work. This can be an open space to ask questions. We can brainstorm on the direction we want to take with regards to how equity affects curriculum. The Chair had earlier mentioned some projects relating to course outlines of record (CORs) and some faculty had talked about possibly working on a cultural curriculum audit of outlines.

Kat Webster asked about how to reflect equity practices in the course outlines; sometimes issues are beyond the committee’s scope, i.e., the structure is mandated. She cited the example of a Political Science course that had been reviewed by the committee in a previous meeting. The course title was Introduction to Political Theory and Thought but it’s really an introduction to western political theory. Would we have to change the title of the whole course to reflect equity? What can we do when we run into systematic things that are holding back equity work? David replied that UCs and CSUs and community colleges are trying to work together to create a bit of synergy, including creating some connectivity between course titles, course numbers, etc. to make things easier for students. This is an ongoing process. We may be asked to fix something this year then update next year. We have to consider positionality; this is very important. Who do we have to bring in to help advance these conversations and get some answers and find out what flexibility is available when we update course outlines? There are levels of bureaucracy and some red tape we have to deal with. It is impossible to do this on one’s own, especially considering that we already have full-time jobs.

David would like his office to create some bridges and spaces, and connect people to the information they are looking for. There are different ways to embed equity into course outlines. We can inform each other about how we might want equity to be reflected in an updated COR. This could be done

through maybe professional development, including one-on-one sessions. Some campuses create retreat-like cohorts and events where folks help update CORs as a group. The idea is that before faculty go in and update their CORs, they have a good understanding of what obstacles might lie ahead, and thus, not waste time. Kat commented that it helps to know that there are team members out there we could tap when we need help.

David inquired about any ongoing committee projects. Chris Walker replied that there is a small workgroup that is updating the Curriculum handbook. They hope to have a draft ready to share with the committee for larger discussions by the end of this semester. David asked how the CORs that are being updated are selected; is it a self-selection process? Chris explained that many of our course outlines are updated on a six-year cycle, with the CTE courses being updated on a two-year cycle, although any course can be modified as needed. The CTEs are on a shorter cycle because they tend to change much faster, and there is some industry pressure and other things. We are working on a project to update the overall meta view of CORs and what we're asking faculty to fill out on the CORs.

Lia Thomas is interested in equity of access, how to communicate with faculty about textbook choices, affordability, and diversity with regards to cost and authorship. The curriculum committees of other colleges are making a real effort to look at the choices of textbooks and readings, particularly in relation to cost. CSM has the Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) coding. This ties in with the curriculum handbook; we can expand on the section on representative texts, e.g., textbook selection. David thinks that Covid has changed things for students. Students have been taking courses virtually and accessing different types of textbooks and literature virtually for the last three years. To address foundational student equity gaps, we need to take a closer look at the financial obstacles that students face. Where are we in terms of campus conversations on this issue? There have been moves in different campuses to improve accessibility for all textbooks and make a kind of virtual platform for this. The Chair replied that the committee hasn't done much with this directly. We have had it on our list of things to do for a while. One of our Instructional Designers, Jennifer Howze-Owens, is the current OER liaison with the State and she's starting to think about this as a potential project. Lia also served as OER liaison last year. Lia explained that the OER lead is just a communicative role; it is not a substantial role on campus. The work has more to do with communicating State information to faculty. CSM, unlike other campuses, does not have a position to support OER and ZTC. Canada provides release time, while Skyline has positions in ASLT that are responsible for facilitating ZTC and doing this work on their campus. We're a little bit behind and there is some misconception that the OER Lead is an actual position, but it is not. The Chair added that some individual departments are working on small things but there is no campus-wide initiative.

David is currently fleshing out how the Equity Committee is going to look like. In the past, it might have focused more on the professional development lens. They could create subgroups for specific projects on campus and possibly connect with other committees. The term "liaison" gets thrown around a lot and there's an expectation that this is someone's job, but it really is not. He will be happy to explore how we can create a small group of faculty and staff to look into this some more and maybe see what other colleges are doing, and what options and resources are available that we might not know of. This could help close some of the equity gaps that students face, especially as it relates to textbooks.

Judith Hunt mentioned that there have been some conversations going on but it would be tricky to try to get a sense of how many people are actually doing OER or ZTC. Some people have been pushing hard to encourage faculty to consider OER and ZTC. There are a lot of options for students to get amazing material for free. Maybe the Bookstore would have some data on how many courses use OER/ZTC. David thinks it could be a bureaucratic issue. If we're into institutionalizing this process, how do we ensure that students get the right material? There could be litigious issues. It takes sustained commitment to be on top of this since we could come up against obstacles and red tape. Students aren't exactly waiting on us right now; they are probably two to three steps ahead of the curve at this

point and are figuring things out on their own. And we don't want to be in a position where we are acting retroactively because we are already behind. It would benefit us to keep up with students on this end.

July thinks that it would be very important to consider how this can be the work of a partnership that is bigger than the Curriculum Committee. Looking at equity is something that should start prior to hitting the Curriculum Committee. The current process does a disservice to faculty in that we expect them to change their outlines once in the workflow. This should be part of a bigger and longer process in the way we approach course design as an institution and the different things that we do. The COR is a consequence of this process. There needs to be cooperation on a larger scale for this to be meaningful. David recounted Long Beach City College's curriculum audit story. A report had showed that they were ranked almost at the bottom in college-level student success rates and they decided that they couldn't wait five or six years to address gap issues. They put a workbook together and did an internal audit, starting with collecting data. They got buy-in from faculty and looked at individual courses (anonymously) to pinpoint gaps with the individual college success rates. They then worked with faculty or classes where they found large gaps. There is a PowerPoint on this and David will be happy to share it with the Committee Chair. LBCC looked not only at CORs but also looked into changes to syllabi, textbook accessibility, learning assignments, etc., making this process more culturally relevant. He agrees that there is much work to be done.

David is working on student equity assessment and is looking at DI data, e.g., proportion to impact data. The SEA will include data on targeted outcomes for 2022 to 2025 and he might need data from the committee. A cultural curriculum audit could be one of the targeted outcomes. Equity touches on so many different areas, as do cultural curriculum audits. The influence extends beyond just one or two classes, and provides a model for us to address larger equity gaps across the campus.

Kat is worried that if more initiatives and workgroups are created that equity will get lost, especially given the workload pilot program and that faculty are already burdened. Some departments don't have enough people to fill what needs to be done, e.g., revising course outlines. Are there ways to work in equity conversations into the processes we already have to evaluate departments, e.g., program review? Academic Senate has been working on making sure that program review is a place where departments can assess their equity work. We don't want the work to fall on deaf ears since everyone is already so overloaded.

David wants to know what our committee processes are. He is mindful of people having time limitations for committee work. There could be overlaps where people can help each other out and make the most of each other's capacities. He is open to having more conversations and become more familiar with collaborative processes so he can see where he fits in and bridge the gaps.

The Chair added that he is wary of turning an idea into a checkbox that faculty fill out on the COR because the purpose could get lost. An example is a checkbox about consulting Library Services to make sure the library has the resources needed for the course. Faculty tend to automatically check the box without actually consulting the library. Chris wants to make sure that the things we do don't just turn into a checkbox on a form but could instead turn into something meaningful and is actually being done. There are other areas in the COR where it feels like the question has been turned into checkboxes for people to check without actually thinking about the question or without having conversations with themselves and others, including their departments when revising courses. Like what Kat had mentioned, we want the work to be meaningful and useful. We don't want to just create new things or new processes for people to do. He will keep the communication lines with David open.

Judith pointed out that in WebSchedule, certain things are indicated, e.g., hybrid, ZTC, etc. Should there be indicators for equity, e.g., how to indicate to students that topics on social justice,

environmental justice, etc. might be considered? For example, a Political Science class could have a focus on issues of environmental justice although this is not an Environmental Studies course. Can equity work be indicated to students, and can this be via a checkbox? David replied that in terms of a broader scope of equity, we hope to embed inclusiveness, cultural responsiveness, and the like into all courses. We are working towards this norm, and can maybe do some piggybacking. Sometimes these equity conversations become about the job or a checkbox instead of the impact. It's important to ensure that we're all at the same starting point and there's a good understanding as to why we're doing this. Sometimes, we don't even have indicators in our spaces as professionals, to fully understand why we do things. If we don't understand that, then it's considered a job where we have this list of things to do and we're being asked to do some other things. If there are indicators and quantitative or qualitative data, as well as information sharing that lays a foundation for why we do things, then the work becomes about impact and not just a job.

David has an open door in 17-140 and also welcomes emails. He hopes to see members in the near future. The Chair thanked David for the discussions. He thinks that we can try to create a bridge with the Education Equity Committee that David is putting together.

- Update to modality of meetings
The Governor signed **AB2449**, a new law which is a compromise update to the Brown Act, and it allows for some version of virtual meetings. Once the state of emergency expires, which is likely to be at the end of December this year, we may need to be back on campus. So potentially, we may need to be back live on campus in the spring. Under the new law, virtual meetings are allowed as long as a quorum of the members are present in person. Those members attending virtually need to have a valid, written, and documented reason for being virtual, and this can only be done for a short number of meetings, around 20% over the course of a year, and it cannot be the same people being virtual the whole time. We are waiting for the interpretation from our legal team on what this means. The Chair dropped some information on the new law in Chat in case people want to read through it.

Meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.