

Curriculum Minutes
Monday, September 25, 2017
3:00-4:30 p.m., BU 119

ATTENDANCE

L. Tenney (Chair), B. Donovan (Curriculum Specialist), D. Amaro, N. Dequin, C. Oler, K. Wagman, F. Lozano, D. Achterman, A. Rosette, J. Grohol, S. Sandler, M. Bresso, N. Cisneros, D. Chavez, P. Henrickson, R. Rivera-Sharboneau, J. Olivas, J. Maringer-Cantu (volunteer minute recorder)

I. Call to Order: Welcome at 3:05pm.

II. Agenda adjustments and approval

MSC (M. Bresso/R. Rivera-Sharboneau) Approved with adjustments.

III. Minutes of May 8, 2017

L. Tenney received the notes from J. Maringer, but she does not have them completed as yet.

IV. Information/Discussion

a. Welcome back and review of current Curriculum Committee membership.

L. Tenney reported that she is sending around a Membership List so please mark the Curriculum Committee representative for your department. She introduced Jennifer Grohol, our new SLO Coordinator/Liaison. She reported it is great that she is here because one of our objectives is to have a better integration of our learning outcomes with our SLOs/PLOs/ILOs. Our new student representative introduced himself, Daniel Chavez. D. Chavez stated that he is our new Gavilan Student trustee, and he will also be serving as our Curriculum Committee student representative. His major is Mathematics, Computer Science and Psychology. Other Curriculum members introduced themselves and stated the department they are representing: Michelle (VP of Academic Affairs), Pat (Child Development/CTE), Nicole (ESL), Rosa (Articulation Officer). Rosa stated that Johanna Stewart is our Counseling Rep. Leslie stated that Dr. Jesus Olivas will be replacing her, as Articulation Officer, during the Spring semester when Rosa is on sabbatical leave. Dr. Olivas has over 30+ years at Gavilan. Other members include: Arturo (Fine Arts), Doug (Library), Ken (Math/Natural Science), Fran (Dean of Liberal Arts & Sciences), Jane (AEC), Debbie (Allied Health), Nikki (Kinesiology), Carlton (Social Sciences), Scott (English), Bonnie (Curriculum Specialist), and Leslie (Curriculum Chair).

b. Tech Review Committee Process

L. Tenney stated that the committee has a lot on our plate with curriculum this year; not only in the number of courses (135) in the queue, but the mandates and rules have changed. To manage the curriculum, we need to look at the following: 1) number of courses, 2) how best to move through the pipeline and 3) whether the tech review or CC have more meetings. Currently we don't have a system in place, especially in how we determine what gets on the agenda. We are in a self-certification process and much more responsible for what we approve or move forward than we ever have done before

so we have to slow down the process to make sure we are accurate. We have the mandates that relate to Guided Pathways, so we have to look at our curriculum and programs, and where are there are guided pathways and what kinds of courses do we need to have for the pathways. There has been a real concentrated effort to how we are scheduling classes, including where, what and how the process is working. We need to make our scheduling and curriculum process more efficient, methodical and deliberate. The bottom-line is we have a deadline to review 135 pieces, and it is currently not possible. We as a group need to collectively determine how are we going to prioritize this curriculum, determine what gets looked at when and how. She is hoping to get a sub-committee together to look at the following questions regarding the courses that are being reviewed: 1) Is it part of the program, 2) Is it a new class or a new program 2) When will it expire, 3) Is it credit or no-credit? J. Grohol asked if we could look at who has assessed their SLO's and who has not as accreditation is coming up. L. Tenney stated that could be another factor to add to the list also Canvas has a document we can use. I am just throwing these ideas up, not going to determine today how to prioritize these factors; it needs to be a faculty group.

J. Maringer stated that earlier you said that we didn't have a system in place and how we determine what gets placed on the agenda, but last year we used to have a consent agenda, where there were classes that had minor changes, because it was their 5-year update, so we were able to pass them. We didn't have to go through each course in detail. Leslie stated that this is where we started when we developed this agenda. At first we learned that the justification was just a tweak, but when we looked at the comparisons & justifications, there were more than what was stated. She stated that last year initially people complained that they were never trained, or they didn't know what it looked like or they were unhappy when things were getting sent back. Leslie said to answer your previous question is that the courses on this agenda are classes that used to be on the consent agenda, but we need to look at the curriculum with more depth and detail and slow it down. Using the consent agenda again is not out of the question.

A. Rosette wonders where the bottleneck is? Is it at the tech review where they need more resources or is it the curriculum committee needs to see more. How much of the bottleneck is at the tech review or how much is at general discussion that needs to happen at the CC?

Rosa thinks it is twofold, 1) training still needs to happen especially when we actually develop the curriculum and 2) make sure the justification matches the changes. There is a complete disconnect. Currently the group has put together a tips guide for faculty. The alignment with the justification is the reality. She thinks that sharing the workload with the group where people actually read the curriculum and were able to dive into more detail was very helpful. Because we shared the review, we were able to complete 50 courses. But now with 165 courses, questions arise such as: do we really need to do all these courses, why did it all come it at once, how do we decide which curriculum goes

out, what are the training needs, how can get consistent information in the justification area? The reasons for bottleneck could be: too much from one department or too much at the deadline. The team approach worked. What is the priority for our department?

R2row suggested we create a system where we self-prioritize such as: courses that have to be done for scheduling issues could be priority 1 or courses that need general updates could be priority 3. Rosa added that we need to address the institutional issues that the programs can do such as: priorities for SLO/PLO accuracy, Guided Pathways, etc. Leslie's showed the committee her brain dump ideas to give direction to the tech review committee. She just added the SLO tip & r2row's self-prioritization by department or discipline.

M. Bresso raised the question to both committee members and department chairs, would there be any value to share these findings at department meetings in helping meet that training piece? The check off list gets longer and more convoluted, the cleaner the curriculum is when it gets to tech review, the faster it goes through approval.

Time out to approve agenda (see above)

r2row asked about the May 8 minutes, and Leslie stated that there are no minutes at this time.

She stated that one of the ideas in which she has been thinking about is that we haven't had any formal training on CurricUNET, and there really are some basic things that we all don't know. Looking at the PCAH is not sufficient to successful training. Leslie asked if we all know about what the PCAH is, and she explained that it is the Program and Course Handbook, which is governed by Title 5, Academic Senate and Chancellor's Office. It ensures that we comply with regulations and law regarding curriculum. Share this PCAH and COR with your departments.

She stated that one of the ideas in which she has been thinking about is that we haven't had any formal training on CurricUNET, and there really are some basic things that we all don't know. Looking at the PCAH is not sufficient to successful training. Leslie asked if we all know about what the PCAH is, and she explained that it is the Program and Course Handbook, which is governed by Title 5, Academic Senate and Chancellor's Office. It ensures that we comply with regulations and law regarding curriculum. Share this PCAH and COR with your departments. Take a look at it as a starting place and identify what our training needs are. Nikki is all for training, but she stated that it is not going to eliminate all the updates and courses to review that we have to approve on the 5-year cycle. Thinking out loud, do we need to meet more often? So much that has to been done, training will help for future purposes. L. Tenney do we need to meet more often. M. Bresso, we need to be thinking programs vs. processes, direct route for students want and needs, programs, attendance & completions over the next 5 or 6 years, responsible, assessing the SLOs. We could pull back some of these courses that

we are using, take some of the work off of the plate. Ultimately think about the programs we are offering and are they what the community wants. Leslie asked if anyone would like to participate in a task force to look at these issues to help determine how we can adjust this. Rosa asked Leslie to repeat the charge of the committee again. Leslie stated that it is to develop a proposal on how we address and prioritize the curriculum as it comes through CurricUNET. Rosa asks if they could also come up with some solutions on how to deal with the backlog of the 146 courses. Scott, r2row, Michelle, Fran, and Leslie have volunteered to be on this task force. Nikki asked if they could keep the Senate informed on what they develop.

c. CurricUNET updates and training items.

Leslie asked Bonnie if there are any updates in CurricUNET, and Bonnie stated that there are none at this time. Debbie asked about the email from Kyle. Bonnie stated that she had asked Kyle to send an email since the program would be down for 4 hours. CurricUNET updates the program every couple of weeks and brings down the system, so she wanted us to be notified. The changes did not apply to anything the faculty were currently working on. Leslie was talking about the other email said that they will be changing the spelling of the program name to include a Q. R2row said that it sounded like they will be making changes so the CurricUNET will be integrated with the building of the catalog. Michelle mentioned that with any software developers, they listen to their customers. The focus is a seamless transmission of information about our courses and programs direct to the catalog. We wanted the feature this time since our PLO office spent hours copying and pasting information into the catalog creation file by hand. Once this module is in place, and it is just a download, then the integration will be seamless.

R2row asked if it was going to change our process. Bonnie said it would not save. Rosa stated that there are two CurricUNET (legacy and meta) systems, and we have the latest system. It will do a lot of different things for us. Leslie wanted to bring up one thing that happened with r2row's classes this week. The transitions request a change, approve or disapprove, could not move it back to him to request a change. Bonnie will help with this issue. Review and go through it with the people in your department who are writing curriculum especially the Course Outline of Record. The justification has changed and you really have to justify the need. Nikki – things will get lost in the system especially 1st reading. Bonnie said that new courses follow a different path and it is a training for Bonnie & Leslie. Nikki should we email you about courses that passed the 1st reading last semester. Bonnie showed us in CurricUNET, where the course is sitting at the very top. For example, Beach Volleyball is at the tech review level. Rosa added one more thing about review proposal, on left hand side, with General Education Pattern, trying to gray it out so don't touch it, cannot import directly into the catalog. Please bypass this area unless you have a green button next to it. Bonnie said that part was that the data load didn't come over correctly, so let Rosa fix it. Leslie said to pay attention to how the textbook information came over, for example, Spanish 1A. Textbook information

imported into one field instead of the designated fields, so it is necessary to fix it. It will reject because fields are missing. Rosa is using CurricUNET to populate ASSIST. Also Bonnie stated that all of these systems are supposed to talk to each other, for example, they moved the out-of-class assignments out of the content area. Michelle said to share this with your faculty, and it is very important that you fix it before you submit it. R2row reported that it would have been helpful knowing this ahead of time. Leslie will add it to the checklist, and we are still learning this system together. Until the subcommittee comes up with prioritization, and consent agenda, tech review still has to have reviewed it very carefully, still takes a lot of time.

d. Curriculum Committee Process

Leslie stated that the process that worked well last year was when certain pieces of curriculum were assigned to subgroups so every one was able to review their pieces more carefully. Rosa asked if we can we make *a motion to continue the process of having the Curriculum Committee members assigned to specific courses on the agenda and responsible for reviewing them before the meeting.*

MSC (R. Rivera-Sharboneau/S. Sandler) Motion passed. All in favor.

e. LEH update

Leslie stated that the group met and created a survey to look at examples of classes that have different LEH factors. Questions are included such as: What do you do for a class with a LEH factor of .65 or What you do for a class with a LEH factor of .75? Keep your eyes open for that survey, she will be sending it to Peter Wruck. R2row asked if the group reached out to other colleges. Leslie stated that we could do that, but we haven't done it yet. It appears to be the same everywhere, for example, an hour is an hour. R2row agreed to help with the research.

V. New Business

1. New Course – Second Reading

- a. SJS 5 Introduction to Women's Studies

MSC (D. Achterman/J. Maringer). Motion to approve.

Leslie reported that Leah spoke about this course at the 2nd reading during the last meeting. Ken asked what were the issues.

Vote: unanimous. Motion passes.

2. Modification to Existing Courses

- a. ART 14A - Introduction to Murals

MSC (A. Rosette/R. Rivera-Sharboneau) Motion to approve.

Discussion: R2row reported that the textbook was updated.

Vote: unanimous. Motion passes.

- b. CSIS 2 - Computers in Business

- c. CSIS 2L - Computers in Business Lab

CSIS 2 and CSIS 2L are taken as one motion.

MSC (R. Rivera-Sharboneau/S. Sandler). Motion to approve.

Discussion: R2row asked if there were any content changes, and Bonnie stated that the content was reviewed not changed. Leslie reported that you need to state that you are submitting this course for the 5-year cycle in the justification. Please don't say that you haven't touched anything, and then we find out later that you have changed items. R2row stated that they did change the out-of-class assignments. Bonnie said that they had to add those assignments or they couldn't submit it. Leslie reiterated that it should be stated in the justification.

Vote: unanimous. Motion passes.

d. CSIS 44 C# .NET Programming

MSC (K. Wagman/R. Rivera-Sharboneau). Motion to approve.

Discussion: Ken questioned the wording "instantiate objects" in the description. Daniel & Michelle looked up and read the definition from the Internet. Rosa said that there was no substantial change it was just being cleaned. Look for red and green font (changed). What was changed? No language was cleaned up under lab. What did he do? Questions came up at the tech review. Jane said that people need this to get the certificate. Michelle stated that they should have been more specific in the justification. Jane stated that it is frustrating when she makes the changes in the format of the content because it is going into the catalog, but the changes do not stay. Bonnie and Leslie stated this is another problem in CurricUNET. Rosa said that it does show that he did clean up, but with all the lab changes, is it a different course? Bonnie stated that CurricUNET is splitting out the lab content. Just note it on the justification. R2row asked if it was approved for LEH, and the changes were created, were they already in the course, then no substantial changes were made. Rosa said we do not know what Alex did. Bonnie stated that Susan Dodd worked with Alex to update this course. Jane asked if we could approve it with the condition of fixing the justification. Leslie stated that this is a bad habit of approving it by having Bonnie go back in and fix it. Michelle stated that approval means as written it is acceptable, and she stated that we should not approve it as is. Jane asked, "What part isn't acceptable except for the justification", he moved the content into the lab section but he did not note into the justification, we are just adding more to the list by putting it on hold. Fran agreed with Jane's point and asked if there was a simple way to move it on. We can pass it with the justification fixes, like we have done many times before. The problem is Alex can't fix the justification, Bonnie has to unlock it first, and it does take a lot of time for Bonnie to fix it. R2row stated what Rosa said before, it looks like the changes are substantial, and it would be nice if Alex were here to answer questions. Besides the lab part, the lecture part is more than just clean up.

The motion on the floor is the approval of CSIS 44 as is. Motion fails. Rosa stated that Pat said she would be willing to take it back to Alex.

MSD. (K. Wagman/R. Rivera-Sharboneau).

Vote: unanimous. Motion fails.

e. HE 1 Health Education

MSC (N. Dequin/S. Sandler). Motion to approve.

Discussion: Debbie stated that the course was in the review cycle and the SLOs were consolidated.

Vote: unanimous. Motion passes.

f. JPN 1A Elementary Japanese

MSC (A. Rosette/N. Dequin). Motion to approve.

Discussion: None.

Vote: unanimous. Motion passes.

g. KIN 17A Golf – Beginning

h. KIN 17B Golf - Intermediate

i. KIN 17C Golf – Advanced

Kin 17A, Kin 17B and Kin 17C are taken as one motion.

MSC (M. Bresso/K. Wagman). Motion to approve.

Discussion: Nikki reported that it was a 5-year update and the SLOs were consolidated.

Vote: unanimous. Motion passes.

j. KIN 19A Badminton - Beginning

k. KIN 19B Badminton - Intermediate

l. KIN 19C Badminton - Advanced

Kin 19A, Kin 19B and Kin 19C are taken as one motion.

MSC (N. Dequin/S. Sandler). Motion to approve.

Discussion: R2row asked about the content, and Bonnie says that she checks the whole thing before uploading.

Vote: unanimous. Motion passes.

m. KIN 20 A Bowling -Beginning

n. KIN 20B Bowling - Intermediate

o. KIN 20C Bowling - Advanced

Kin 20A, Kin 20B and Kin 20C are taken as one motion.

MSC (S. Sandler/M. Bresso). Motion to approve.

Discussion: same as before.

Vote: unanimous. Motion passes.

- p. KIN 62A Yoga - Beginning
- q. KIN 62B Yoga - Intermediate
- r. KIN 62C Yoga – Advanced

Kin 62A, Kin 62B and Kin 62C are taken as one motion.

MSC (A. Rosette/K. Wagman). Motion to approve.

Discussion: same as before.

Vote: unanimous. Motion passes.

- s. KIN 66B Dance Fundamentals - Intermediate
- t. KIN 66A Dance Fundamentals - Beginning
- u. KIN 66C Dance Fundamentals – Advanced

Kin 66A, Kin 66B and Kin 66C are taken as one motion.

MSC (M. Bresso/J. Maringer). Motion to approve.

Discussion: same as before.

Vote: unanimous. Motion passes.

~~v. KIN 71A Self-Defense – Level 1~~

w. KIN 73A Fitness Through Dance - Level 1

~~x. KIN 70B Pilates – Level 2-Kin~~

y. KIN 73B Fitness Through Dance - Level 2

z. KIN 73C Fitness Through Dance - Level 3

Kin 73A, Kin 73B and Kin 73C are taken as one motion.

MSC (M. Bresso/N. Dequin). Motion to approve.

Discussion: R2row asked if this dance class was cross-listed with Theater 11, and Nikki said that it was not.

Vote: unanimous. Motion passes.

aa. PHIL 7B - History of Philosophy: Renaissance to Modern Periods

MSC (A. Rosette/R. Rivera-Sharboneau). Motion to approve.

Discussion: R2row stated that it is a general update, SLO and out of class assignments. Leslie stated that he has good comments to his department especially in the justification area, and to catch the mistakes at that level before it is posted. She said that it is very helpful to look at the history; it gives the author an opportunity to work on the changes.

Vote: unanimous. Motion passes.

bb. PHYS 2A - General Physics I

MSC (N. Dequin/S. Sandler). Motion to approve.

Discussion: Ken stated that it was a SLO update and the methods of evaluation numbers were fixed.

Vote: unanimous. Motion passes.

cc. SPAN 1A - Elementary Spanish

MSC (A. Rosette/S. Sandler). Motion to approve.

Discussion: R2row stated that it is the same as before.

Vote: unanimous. Motion passes.

dd. THEA 12A Acting I

ee. THEA 12B Acting II

Thea 12A and Thea 12B are taken as one motion.

MSC (A. Rosette/K. Wagman). Motion to approve.

Discussion: R2row stated that it is the same as before.

Vote: unanimous. Motion passes.

Leslie would like to discuss one more point before we adjourn about the priorities task force. She suggests that we get a representative from the Non-credit and CTE departments because of the many different issues. Please encourage members from CTE and Non-credit to join us.

Jane asked if Jenny wanted to speak about what she is doing regarding her position. Jenny stated that as the SLO liaison, we have been working on mapping the ILOs to PLOs, and she has created a simple Google form to send out to people to check off in a matrix, but we are putting this mapping on hold for the moment because we are still finalizing the ILOs. If you have any suggestions that she can do to make the process easier, please let her know. Ken said that the union is working on giving a stipend for SLO work. He also suggested that we wait. R2row stated that we are talking about 2 different things (mapping is curricular). Ken said yes, but we may need to update the PLOs before we map them, so this work may be negotiable.

Leslie asked Jenny if she would you like for this area to be added as a discussion item for the next meeting, and Jenny agreed.

Ken announced the Accreditation Kick-off tomorrow at 2:30-3:30 in the North/South Lounge. He will bring cookies.

Michelle encouraged volunteers to be a part of accreditation. She stated that we could use your help since the work needs to be done by February.

VII. Adjournment by consensus at 4:45 pm.

MSC (N. Dequin).