College of San Mateo

Curriculum Committee

September 26, 2024 (2:15 p.m.)
Building 10, Room 10-468 and
Zoom Meeting: https://smccd.zoom.us/j/85737096180
Meeting ID: 857 3709 6180
Call in using: +1 669 444 9171 US

MINUTES

Members Present

Chair	Jeramy Wallace
Academic Support and Learning Technologies	David Laderman, Lia Thomas
ASCSM Student Representative	Wai Yan Oo
Articulation Officer	Marsha Ramezane
Business/Technology	Sujata Verma, Lale Yurtseven
Counseling/Student Services	Leonardo Cruz, Trang Luong
Creative Arts & Social Science	Judith Hunt
Instructional Design	Julieth Benitez
Language Arts Division	Tamara Perkins
Math/Science Division	Christopher Smith

Non-Voting Members	Danni Redding Lapuz, Deborah Laulusa, Tammy Wong

Absent/Excused

Creative Arts & Social Science	Malathi Iyengar
Kinesiology Division	Shana Young
Language Arts Division	Kristi Ridgway
Math/Science Division	Beth LaRochelle

Other Attendees	Guillermo Cockrum, Monique Nakagawa, Gil Perez, Makiko Ueda, Madeline Wiest, Todd Windisch

Chair, Jeramy Wallace, called the meeting to order at 2:19 p.m. Motion by Judith Hunt to approve the agenda, seconded by Leo Cruz, all members voting "Aye."

Public Comments (2 minutes/person)
Judith: Question – if faculty have a question about common course numbering templates, who should they talk to?

Jeramy: If the question is template-related (e.g. adding content and criteria questions), they should talk to me. Keep in mind that when they're adding stuff, there should not be so much added that it changes the fundamental course. But Marsha also brought up the importance of making sure the new course outline is as close to the old one as possible for articulation agreements. So you have to think about both these things as you are working on this. So it's really a matter of going through and trying to figure out what's not on the template that's on our current course outline. And should we add those missing elements to part 2?

Chris Smith: Have we seen these course outlines yet?

Jeramy: We haven't seen them. The Committee will see them during the November 14th meeting after the faculty submits them by the October 17th deadline for tech review. During tech review, we will make sure they match the templates so we don't have to worry about that as much. Jeramy can send a link to the templates if members want to look at them side by side with the submitted outline.

CONSENT AGENDA

Motion by Marsha Ramezane to approve the consent agenda, seconded by Lale Yurtseven, all members voting "Aye."

- **Approval of minutes from the September 12, 2024 meeting**

- **Course Modification(s)**

BUS.	103	Business Information Systems (3.0)
		(DE update; 2-year update; change in objectives, content, assignments)
BUS.	123	Business Statistics (3.0)
		(DE update; 2-year update; change in description, SLOs, objectives, content, evaluation, 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 preparations, the full committee is expected to review prerequisites and recommended preparations statements for all proposals to ensure compliance with Title V regulations.

- **New Course(s)**

  COUN 680MA Personal Development and Self-Exploration (1.0) – ***approved with changing experimental course to permanent course number (COUN 103), addition of lecture content, and placement in GE Area 7.*** *Discipline assignment: Counseling or Psychology. Motion by Judith, seconded by Chris, all members voting "Aye."* Jeramy explained that this course was originally submitted last Spring, but it missed the deadline as an experimental course for Fall 2024. Let's just make it a permanent course, and Deb Laulusa provided COUN 103 as the new number for this permanent course. Sujata Verma recommended adding a socio-emotional learning component in the lecture content, and members agreed that this would provide clear guidance for any new faculty teaching this course to

include this content. "Socioemotional learning" is added to the Lecture Content list. The Committee also felt like this course fits in well with GE Area 7, and that it should placed there.

OPEN AGENDA

- **Policy on Courses in Multiple GE Areas**
  Jeramy attended the District Curriculum Committee, and it was brought up that Cañada and Skyline do not allow courses to be put into multiple GE areas for local degrees. Should CSM consider the same policy? Marsha Ramezane commented that History courses are listed in both Humanities and Social Science in the IGETC, CSU, and Cal-GETC patterns. Judith stated that the emphasis should be put on giving students the most options and most flexibility. Chris asked about whether these courses are counted twice, and Jeramy said that no double-dipping is allowed, and while a course can be listed in two areas, they can only be counted in one area.

  And what about Area 7? Do we want to proposed that whatever is in Area 7 will not show up in other areas? Jeramy passed around a proposal for Area 7 courses. The courses with the asterisk are those listed in other GE areas.

  The Committee agreed to maintain status quo and allow for courses to be listed in multiple GE areas.

- **Curriculum Handbook First Read**
  Jeramy sent out the handbook this past Tuesday, and since then, he has received comments and revisions about p. 10, SLOs, and DE. Guillermo Cockrum, CSM SLO Coordinator, spoke about SLOs in the context of ILOs, and he will share edits and language for this. Marsha sent updated GE language. Jeramy requested Committee members to read the areas in which you work in and made edits. We'd like to finalize by our December meeting in time for ISER, which according to Todd, is also due in December, with a final draft due at the end of Spring 2025. For edits, a Google Doc will be created, and shared with the members as reviewers so that they can comment and suggest changes.

  The Committee discussed SLOs guidelines, and the reminder to always think about the assessment component, too, and that each SLO needs to be evaluated. The Common Courses will have prepackaged ones, plus what you add to them. What is the recommended number of SLOs? Guillermo said less is more, and to think about ILOs when you write SLOs, to align everything. Danni Redding Lapuz, Acting VPI, said that three is a good sweet spot. Julieth Benitez brought up the topic of SLOs and Objectives being the same. Do we maintain this or do we make these distinctions explicit (which is what's in the handbook revision now)? If you have comments, put in your thoughts in the Google Doc. Sujata mentioned that with C-ID, the number of SLOs went up because C-ID wanted her to add some of her content items into the SLO section. Jeramy said that you have the freedom to control the SLOs, but there are outside influences like the Common Course numbering, UC, CSU, and C-ID.

  The CCN gives course objectives, and then we're going to let faculty come up with their own SLOs. The Committee discussed how objectives and SLOs are related, but since CCNs give the objectives, you're limited in value because the objectives lead to the SLOs. If you have the same broad SLOs, you can get there many different ways. If the emphasis is on course objectives, then you don't have many ways, and it seems sort of backwards.

Julieth brought up the Handbook format. As a PDF link on webpages, any modifications would require manual updating of the link on every page. If Google Doc or Canvas is used, it is very responsive and accessible. The Committee will figure this out.

Jeramy asked that the Committee members share the Handbook revision with other faculty to see if there's missing information and if the information is helpful. This will be a standing agenda item to be completed by December.

- **Distance Education Addendum Discussion**
  Jeramy had a meeting with Donna Eyestone (CSM DE Coordinator) and Julieth (Tech Review Committee) to discuss the issue of currently inputted DE addendums in Curricunet being essentially identical to the ones inputted in 2020. Donne and Julieth would like to change the DE addendum to require faculty to think about the pedagogy when moving a course online or hybrid. The current form is not intentional, and faculty just transfer the same information from field to field. If the form cannot be changed, then Donna developed new guidance in the Handbook revision to provide some guidance to encourage people to think more critically.

  Is there a way to modify the form to encourage people to think about the modality beyond copying and pasting from the previous semester? For example, there is an "Accessibility" checkbox that only needs to be checked off without having to list out the ways that you are making your course accessible.

  There's also concerns that course authors who have QOTL training and the person actually teaching the online course are not always the same. So the person who is teaching it does not have the QOTL training and should not be teaching online. Judith asked if it should be the Deans or someone checking this, since the person writing the course can't foresee who will be teaching. Chris agreed that the Dean is the obvious person. Jeramy said this needs to be agendized for Spring because there's a staggering number of faculty not trained for online and teaching online. There was an issue before of funding for QOTL training, but that is not currently the issue. Julieth tracks the online teaching numbers, and the lists of faculty out of compliance are sent to Deans and faculty, but at the end of the day, it is the Dean's purview to assign a faculty member a course.

  David Laderman brought the discussion back to revising the DE form to minimize copying and pasting. He suggests including a couple of targeted questions so that it is not just a tiresome and generic form and a hoop to jump over. From members' comments, it sounds like the DE form in Curricunet can be revised, and Jeramy will check with the Distance Education Advisory Committee (DEAC) and tri-chairs Donna, Jennifer, and Erica to see if there is bandwidth for collaboration to move this conversation forward.

- **Area 7 Course Placement First Read**
  Jeramy referenced the Area 7 document passed out earlier. Using the five standards approved by the Committee last Spring and looking at course catalog descriptions, Jeramy took a first pass at placing courses in Area 7. He took out discipline-specific courses and kept courses in that are going to help student look at multiple disciplines. The ones with a "?" next to them need a closer look at their course outlines to see if they are a good fit for the area.

  Jeramy asked the Committee members to talk to the colleagues of these courses before we vote to remove these courses from Area 7. If a department wants to advocate for keeping a course in Area 7, have them review the course outlines and see if the course meets one or more of the rubric

requirements and bring evidence to an upcoming meeting for keeping the course in Area 7. Keep in mind that courses that we place in here have an intentional purpose, and it's not a catch-all space. For departments whose courses do not fit the Area 7 rubric, it is recommended that Division reps get something in writing from them that they know their classes are being removed from Area 7. Last Spring, the Committee voted that Area 7 be a 3-unit requirement, with at least one unit required to be an activity course. Students could technically take three units of P.E. or a combination with one P.E. unit. There was discussion regarding Military Service Credit for Area 7, and Madeline Wiest shared the [Military Service Credit 2023-2024 information on the SMCCD website](#) that states that they are exempt from having to complete Area 7.

The Committee also discussed speaking with Edgar Coronel and the Enrollment Services Committee about adding CSM GE Areas as a searchable field in Webschedule.

Meeting adjourned at 3:33 p.m.