

## CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES

October 24, 2016

3:00-4:30 p.m., BU 119

### **ATTENDANCE**

L. Tenney, B. Donovan, J. Stewart, R. Sharboneau, P. Henrickson, J. Maringer-Cantu, D. DiDenti, E. Luna, F. Lozano, N. Cisneros, J. Rekedal, N. Dequin, K. Wagman, K. Rose, D. Achterman, S. Carr, and E. Talavera (minute recorder).

- I. Call to Order: Welcome and meeting called to order at 3:07 pm.
- II. Agenda adjustments and approval  
**MSC (K. Wagman). Approved as presented.**
- III. Minutes of October 10, 2016  
**MSC (N. Cisneros/N. Dequin). Vote: unanimous. Approved as presented.**
- IV. Information/Discussion
  1. CurricUNET updates and corrections: B. Donovan  
B. Donovan sent out a list of all programs that should be in CurricUNET and asked the members to look at their own programs to review and make sure their programs are updated and correct. L. Tenney also included that a list of programs was sent out to divisions as well. Once an item is approved, an email is sent out to the committee. This allows one to look at where the item is in the process. The Tech Committee cannot formally review and provide feedback until the dean has approved and moved a course forward. Once the course is approved by the Chancellor's Office then B. Donovan can activate the course.

#### Program Updates

2. Courses in suspension status: K. Rose  
L. Tenney gave an update on the current system to suspend a course. Currently, there is a list of courses that are slated to be updated or else the course is suspended for the upcoming semester. Dr. Rose was asked to clarify the process.  
Dr. Rose replied that when a course is on the list it needs to be updated. The reason for suspending a course was to not allow a course to be scheduled without first being updated. Once the deans obtain the list of courses on suspension, it needs to be a priority. B. Donovan added that the faculty is given the courses that need updating but don't get it updated until the end of the semester which causes a gap for scheduling the courses. F. Lozano suggested that maybe the courses need to be backed up a semester and create a pre-suspension list. B. Donovan can back up everything a semester so updates will be at four and a half years instead of five years. N. Dequin asked that now that S. Dodd is on board, will this problem take care of itself. Dr. Rose replied that it will have to be a cooperative approach and if a course is not updated then a hard suspension is performed, no matter the course. The departments had notifications and a grace period to keep the course off the suspension list. E. Luna added that people are being asked to keep to the timeline or else the course will not be offered. It can be done as a practice and not necessarily needs to be done through technology. L. Tenney added that you can't do it with the technology but someone will have to go in and pull the course since the practice is that the faculty or department has until the last meeting. E. Luna clarified that the structure needs to be more methodical and the message should be sent out that updates need to be done that can be as simple as a statement. R. Sharboneau pointed out that there needs to be clarification of what is to be offered or not for the semester. These lists need to be updated and backing

up the timeline is a good thing to do along with taking action on the courses. Courses on the suspension list should not be available to be placed on the schedule.

B. Donovan pointed that the upcoming spring semester deadline has passed. L. Tenney added that the committee needs to define what the practice will be from this point forward. Dr. Rose replied that at the next Tech Review committee meeting wording on the vote should be created. Also, a policy should be created and placed on the website for all to be informed. The campus needs to make sure the curriculum is current and it is good to have the conversation now since accreditation is coming up in two years.

3 Courses to be updated and on hold: L. Tenney

Discussed in combination with above item.

4 Prioritizing Committee Goals: L. Tenney

L. Tenney thanked the committee for the responses to the survey on surveymonkey. The priority list is:

- (1) Addressing the LEH/Lecture Lab calculations. This will be worked on with K. Wagman
- (2) Evaluating disproportionate impacts of courses with new prerequisites
- (3) Impact reports, how to review them and what they mean
- (4) Determination of transfer level courses. R. Sharboneau gave an update on the Assist conference she attended and what is expected of the campus in the updating of the program.
- (5) How new disciplines are added
- (6) Updates to Curriculum Committee bylaws
- (7) Courses “on hold” that need either to be activated and taught or deactivated.

L. Tenney added that the thought is to split these up and work on them throughout the semester. K. Wagman updated that there is no way to change a LEH factor unless it is at the negotiation table. What is needed is for the Curriculum Committee to define the standards. The committee is asked for the pedagogy aspect. F. Lozano suggested that K. Child be added to the conversation since he was there at its creation. K. Wagman feels that the negotiators are looking for what is the current definition. The suggestion is to look at the pedagogy on the Curriculum website and apply it to the course to see if it is current. It was suggested to look at the criteria first before looking at course to course. R. Sharboneau asked the question on what is the current definition. K. Wagman added that it may need to go through negotiations.

K. Rose asked about the sixth edition of the Program and Course Approval Handbook (PCAH) which L. Tenney added that it might be out by the end of December. K. Rose added that the PCAH needs to be reviewed to give some good criteria to have in-depth conversation and add that to what is currently being used before moving on with the conversation.

It was asked if non-credit should be added to the list. L. Tenney added that it should be placed on the list since it is curriculum. R. Sharboneau suggested that a small task force from the Curriculum Committee be created to pull resources to help guide the conversation. L. Tenney will bring materials she has to the next meeting. Once it has been brought through Curriculum, then a subcommittee can be created.

V. Curriculum

1 New Course Proposal – Second Reading

- a. CSIS 575      Assistive Computer Technology for Reading & Writing

This course provides instruction in effective use of assistive computer technology for reading and writing assistance.

**MSC (B. Boeding /F. Lozano). Vote: unanimous. Motion passes.**

- b. JFT 8A      Firefighter I Academy Skills Review and Certification

This course reinforces, combines, and integrates the skills learned in the basic fire academy in accordance with the State Fire Marshal Firefighter 1 curriculum.

- c. JFT 300 Company Officer Academy  
This course provides the knowledge and skills necessary for developing aspiring company officers.
- d. JFT 305 Outdoor Emergency Care  
This 125 hour course is designed to prepare students to render prehospital basic life support services, including cardiopulmonary resuscitation, with emphasis on field application, practices, and techniques vital to the interaction of Outdoor Emergency Care Technician with all levels of emergency medical personnel.

*A motion was made to consider JFT 300 and 305 along with JFT 8A.*

**MSC (D. Achterman/N. Dequin). Vote: unanimous. Motion passes.**

## 2 Modification to Existing Courses

- a. JFT3 Fire Mgmt I - Management, Supervisor for Company Officers  
Change hours from 1 Units, .22 Lec, 2.1 Lab to 1 Unit, .77 Lec, 1.43 Lab. This is a required course for Level 1 Fire Officer certification.
- b. JFT 5A Fire Investigation 1A  
Change hours from 1 Unit, .22 Lec, 2.1 Lab to 1 Unit, .45 Lec, 1.78 Lab. This course provides California State Fire Marshal required training for fire investigators.  
*JFT 3 and 5A are taken as one motion.*

**MSC (J. Maringer-Cantu/K. Wagman). Vote: unanimous. Motion passes.**

- c. JLE 121 Advanced Officer Training  
Change Units and hours from 2 Units, 1 Lec, 3.57 Lab to .5 – 1 Unit, .35 - .5 Lec, .57 – 2.6 Lab. Add repetition. The state requires annual ongoing training for law enforcement.

**MSC (J. Maringer-Cantu/N. Dequin). Vote: unanimous. Motion passes.**

- d. WTRM 107 Beginning Wastewater Treatment Operations
- e. WTRM 108 Water Distribution 2
- f. WTRM 109 Advanced Water Treatment Plant Operation
- g. WTRM 111 Advanced Wastewater Treatment Plant Operation
- h. WTRM 112 Applied Hydraulics
- i. WTRM 113 Beginning Wastewater Collection
- j. WTRM 115 Supervision

*WTRM 107, 108, 109, 111, 112, 113, and 115 are taken as one motion.*

The above courses are on the five year review cycle. The content was reviewed, textbooks updated to the most current edition, and SLO's were reviewed with information about assessment dates included. R. Sharboneau commented that these courses don't have an equivalent transfer course at the four-year university. It is suggested that these courses be converted to a 200-level course. S. Carr will have a conversation with R. Sharboneau and bring back to another meeting when more needs to be changed with the courses. J. Rekedal added that should the courses add up to 100 percent. B. Donovan would prefer a paragraph that describes the important factors and not the percentages. Percentages are a good guideline for instructors and students.

**MSC (F. Lozano/D. DiDenti). Vote: unanimous. Motion passes.**

## VI. New Business

### 1 ASCCC resolutions regarding curriculum

L. Tenney discussed the resolutions coming up at the Academic Senate plenary. A. Rosette, Academic Senate president, asked for the Curriculum Committee to read the curriculum specific resolutions for feedback when voting on these resolutions. K. Wagman brought up an issue with the courses being taught by high school instructors, which has been an issue at other colleges but not Gavilan. R. Sharboneau asked the committee to take a clear look at all the resolutions.

A temperature check was taken on the resolutions since the fall plenary will occur before the next Curriculum Committee.

*Resolution 9.01:* D. Achterman commented that a single process is great. S. Carr added that the process is not the problem but the speed of the process is the issue. B. Donovan added that there are steps that need to be followed which takes time. The process is that it goes through two readings at the Curriculum Committee and then goes to the Board then the Chancellor's office which takes time. Dr. Rose added that the Chancellor's office is improving when curriculum comes to their office. J. Maringer-Cantu asked if courses could be offered temporarily until approved. L. Tenney will look into that question. E. Luna added that CTE moves quickly since CTE works with the market. A majority of the committee agrees to support this resolution. It was asked that A. Rosette report back on these items to the committee.

*Resolution 9.02:* K. Wagman added that the campus is doing the right process, which is what guides this resolution.

VII. Old Business

VIII. Adjournment by consensus at 4:32 pm.

**MSC (K. Wagman/F. Lozano).**