

College of San Mateo

Curriculum Committee

October 27, 2022 (2:15 p.m.)

<https://smccd.zoom.us/j/81632401755?pwd=R1ZuZHY4T0JJVStTQWJiVmp5dGJCZz09>

MINUTES

Members Present

Chair	Christopher Walker
Academic Support and Learning Technologies	Lia Thomas
ASCSM Student Representative	Michelle Aguilar Valdovinos
Business/Technology	Pete von Bleichert
Creative Arts & Social Science	Jeremy Ball, Judith Hunt
Instructional Design	Julieth Benitez
Kinesiology Division	Shana Young
Language Arts Division	Kat Webster
Student Services	Trang Luong

Non-Voting Members

Carla Grandy, Ada Delaplaine, Marsha Ramezane

Absent/Excused

Business/Technology	Mounjed Moussalem
Language Arts Division	Robbie Baden
Math/Science Division	Beth LaRochelle, Christopher Smith

Other Attendees

Michelle Brown, Teresa Morris, Andrew Silva, Andreas Wolf

Chair, Chris Walker called the meeting to order at 2:19 p.m. Motion by Pete von Bleichert to approve the agenda, seconded by Marsha Ramezane, all members voting "Aye."

Consent Agenda

- **Approval of minutes from the meeting from October 13, 2022**
- **Reaffirmation of the Brown Act resolution in emergency situations**
- **Course Modifications**

CIS	121	UNIX/Linux (3) (DE update; 2-year update; changes in texts)
CIS	138	Internet of Things (3) (DE update; 2-year update; changes in description and texts)
CIS	151	Computer Networking (3) (DE update; 2-year update; changes texts)
CIS	262	Discrete Mathematics for Computer Science (3)

		(DE update; 2-year update; changes in objectives, assignments and texts)
CIS	264	Computer Organization and Systems Programming (4)
		(DE update; 2-year update; changes in description and texts)

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**

- | | | |
|------|-----|---|
| TEAM | 194 | <p>Women's Basketball Theory: Defense (1.5-3.0) – approved with changes to SLOs, and typo corrections to description and writing assignments. Discipline assignment: Coaching. Motion by Shana Young, seconded by Jeremy Ball, all members voting "Aye."
(New DE Supplement; proposed for GE Area E4: Physical Education)</p> <p>Discussion regarding SLO #3 and SLO #4 being redundant, but after discussion, the SLOs are distinct. However, SLO #3 was modified to "Analyze, demonstrate and evaluate the effectiveness of various defensive techniques". SLO #4 is different from SLO #1 because SLO #1 focuses on individual player and SLO #4 on team, so keep them as is. Typo corrections in description: change "the defensive techniques" to "of defensive techniques," and typo "written" under representative assignments. Discussion of non-team students enrolling in the course and making clear the recommended preparations so students with appropriate skill-level are in course for their own safety. There was agreement to include this new course as part of the pending Kinesiology A.A.-T program revision.</p> |
|------|-----|---|

- **Course Modifications**

- | | | |
|------|-----|--|
| DGME | 100 | <p>Media in Society (3) – approved with changes to SLOs. Motion by Chris Smith, seconded by Jeremy Ball, all members voting "Aye."
(DE update; 2-year update; changes in description, SLOs, objectives, content, methods of instruction, assignments and texts) Change to add back information competency SLOs. Determine the extent of information needed. Not changing information competency SLOs, although there were comments on the number of information competency SLOs and measuring them. Lia will be taking back comments on wording of SLOs, number of information competency SLOs, and the listing of them to the Library work group. Also comments on necessity of inputting the same number of SLOs as course objectives, meriting future discussions for possible modifications in this area.</p> |
| VARS | 400 | <p>Varsity Water Polo: Men and Women (3) – approved with changes to course description, SLO, and recommended prep. Motion by Shana Young, seconded by Jeremy Ball, all members voting "Aye."
(6-year update; changes in title, prerequisite, description, SLOs, objectives, and methods of instruction)</p> <p>Andreas Wolf apologized to the committee for having to postpone the course a couple of times. Preliminary modifications were made by Wolf and another kinesiology coach before the new coach, Andrew, was hired. Andrew has since reviewed other college's course outlines, and he will be involved in the course development with Andreas. Both</p> |

are in attendance. Discussion on prerequisite versus recommended prep. Judith Hunt feels that there should be a prerequisite and not just recommended prep since this is a safety issue for students to be able to swim. Julieth suggested possibly adding information to the catalog description to emphasize. Add to first sentence, "Intercollegiate competition in water polo for men and women with previous competitive aquatic experience." Will leave wording as recommended preparation as most other community colleges do instead of prerequisite. New Recommended Preparation: Previous competitive aquatic experience is recommended. Reframe SLO #2: Apply team tactics used in the sport of water polo in practice and in competition.

- **Memos**

Math memo for prerequisite edits – approved. *Motion by Jeremy Ball, seconded by Chris Smith, all members voted "Aye."*

Moving to remove lower-level math courses, but starting by changing the prerequisite language for MATH 120 to only state the phrase of Intermediate Algebra (instead of listing the course number), or placement by other measures as applicable for MATH 125, 130, 145, 200, 225, and 241. Discussion of how other subject areas that have MATH 120 as a prerequisite will have to figure out new language so students are aware that they need certain skills coming in to those courses and how students' potential gaps are filled since they will not have the luxury of extra support as the math courses provide. Kat asked about adding the equivalent high school course, i.e. commonly referred to as Algebra II, this was not recommended since we are not supposed to call out equivalencies with high school courses. It was also suggested that this would be a counseling conversation and not something that would be included in the description. Keep new prerequisite language more general so that multiple options meet the prerequisite without having to update document each time there's a new option. Chris to have future discussions across the district for ideas related to removing MATH 120 and math competency for General Education course prerequisites. Not technically a prerequisite change, so this will be a rewording of the prerequisite done on the backend for courses approved in the past year.

LSKL 855 memo for edited catalog description – approved memo as amended. *Motion by Jeremy Ball, seconded by Chris Smith, all members voted "Aye."* Per the last meeting, Joyce and Chris provided a more concise description. Jeremy suggested removing "in the world" since beyond the math classroom was sufficient (from the second sentence).

Open Agenda

- **Course Outline of Record – A Case Study**

Chris brought up a sample course outline, Film 100 and opened the floor to have members ask questions about any area of the outline. Chris Smith asked about the description. Kat and Julieth's suggestion having the description generate interest and marketing to students. Chris Smith thinks it is a balance between describing the course and making it interesting for students to want to take the course. Teresa mentioned that some descriptions also have to keep in mind articulation. General courses should also include "A survey of..." Marsha stated that if a course is geared towards articulation it needs to be factual and follow guidelines (e.g. UCs and CSUs) for general education. Be interesting to compare course outlines to two classes at different levels to see how the wording denotes the difference in the courses.

For C-ID and AA-T approval, it is necessary to use the right words to gain alignment. When doing course review you look at articulation and see if non-student facing. Some C-ID descriptors don't allow for a lot

of flexibility to make the outline balance with requirements and student facing. You can add more after the guidelines have been met, i.e. add the fun stuff at the end.

Judith recalls the committee commenting on some descriptions being too long. It would be better to have a clear sense of what a catalog description is for, so that the committee can be consistent during reviews. Robbie mentioned how there is no style guide for consistency, and it would be interesting to consider having one. And asked if it is necessary to have the descriptions the same in both the catalog as in CurricUNET. Teresa said It does need to be the same, per Title 5, and also that is how our catalog is created. The descriptions come directly from CurricUNET. Kat mentioned some courses like Computer Science may need to include the jargon in the description. Julieth said to consider the difference in descriptions and jargon between an introductory class and an advance class. She suggested getting feedback from students about our catalog descriptions. Our student member was asked about the phrase Introductory survey of fundamental film and if students would understand what that means, and student responded that not all students may not know what “survey” means. Perhaps deleting that word, or changing that word to another one to make the description accessible for all students to understand. Per Kat, our essential criteria is to evaluate, so it would be good to know what we are looking for as we review. Discussions will continue.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.