

Curriculum Minutes  
Monday, November 13, 2017  
3:00-4:30 p.m., BU 119

**ATTENDANCE**

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

Absent: B. Donovan (Curriculum Specialist), J. Grohol, J. Stewart

**I. Call to Order:** Welcome at 3:05pm. (L. Tenney)

**II. Approval of Agenda**

**MSC (P. Williams/A. Rosette). All in favor.**

**III. Approval of Minutes**

Minutes from October 23, 2017

**MSC (A. Rosette/N. Dequin) Vote: Motion passes.**

**IV. Information/Discussion**

1. Methods of Evaluation/page 29, [The Course Outline of Record: A Curriculum Reference Guide Revisited](#) – Bonnie

Leslie stated that percentages in the Methods of Evaluation section are not required by the PCAH, so we might consider removing them from CurricUNET.

2. Textbook data in CurricUNET – Leslie

Leslie stated that in the transition to CurricUNET, some textbook data was populated in the wrong columns, so please review your textbook info before submitting anything in CurricUNET. Arturo asked if we can request clerical assistance to correct the formatting problem? M. Bresso asked Bonnie if we have asked CurricUNET to fix this issue? Information comes from CurricUNET, but the formatting isn't easy to work with. Nikki asked if there was a way to find out when items were submitted, and she found out that there was when she was in Irvine. She said that CurricUNET populates a spreadsheet when courses are submitted. Leslie stated that the problem is the back and forth and not knowing where it is in the process. Nikki said she would send Leslie the example spreadsheet for review.

3. Department training – Mapping SLOs to PLOs: Arturo/Bonnie

Arturo reported that he is trying something new and that he has been meeting individually with his departmental programs, and then they had a large meeting as a department. He had two workshops: 1) Program planning and 2) SLO/PLO mapping and providing the context on why they would be doing it. They discussed more global issues such as: Guided Pathways, streamlining majors and degrees, looked at degrees and how clear the pathways currently are, looked at PLOs, and then did a CurricUNET training on how to map SLOs to PLOs. They asked

the question of what's the difference between the two degrees (AA-T and local degree). They looked at the degrees and then the program learning outcomes and asked if they are as streamlined as they could be. He invited Bonnie to the department meeting as a resource and she helped everyone with the technical information. Leslie stated that it was effective way to look at ILOs, PLOs, and SLOs, and using it as a platform and engaging the department in the system and helped to put the information in a framework on how this all fits together. R2row talked about Jenny, our SLO coordinator earlier in the semester creating a video on the technical way to map in CurriUNET, but he put a stop to that direction because we first need a training video on how to provide the context because just checking the boxes is out of context. Arturo mentioned that we need training before we map the SLO's to provide context. Leslie asked if others could work with them on developing something similar for their departments? Jane likes that idea and looks at it as making the connection where we started with our task force on cleaning up our ILOs. She sees the mapping and assessing going together, and r2row is taking it one step further and analyzing the programs and how they fit. R2row wants to look at the programs first to see if they will need the degrees at all and whether they should keep them, and then look at the PLO and then the SLOs. R2row wants to identify whether the program is important first, and then go to see how it fits with our ILOs and then we will find our deficiencies and address them at that time. Jane agreed with R2row that we need to have training on how to do both the mapping and assessment once we have looked at every program contextually. Leslie stated that this could be a professional development activity. R2row said we want to foresee the future of Guided Pathways and look at majors first and directing the mapping itself through this contextual process, and we do not want to do this many times. He sees the mapping at a later date because doing it right now would be like de-contextualizing it. Leslie says it is a cyclical concept. Nikki says we have to have these dialogues within our department, and see how they all tie in.

M. Bresso stated that Guided Pathways is a vehicle that allows us to strengthen the route for students to reach their goals and a way for us to strengthen curriculum. As a result of participating in the Guided Pathways process, we can share our work in Gavilan's Quality Focus Essay for Accreditation. Our work in GP will likely be reflected in this. Jane asked if once the new ILOs are approved, could we offer this kind of training to all faculty.

#### 4. [ILO Presentation](#) – Scott Sandler, Jane Maringer

Scott presented the ILOs Draft #2 in collaboration with Doug, Nikki, Jane, Peter Wruck, Michele, with input from Leslie and Arturo. This process goes back to when we decided to look at the SLO's in the Department Chair meeting. We took a backwards design and looked at the ILO's which were too many and some of them could not be measured. We cleaned them up. The long-term goals were to make this process inclusive, how to facilitate campus-wide discussions around our Gavilan's ILOs, and they wanted to honor the original ILOs and to inform the new ones. The new ILOs needed to be measurable; they needed to capture changes that have occurred on our campus; seven categories were reduced to four; wording was changed utilizing more active verbs. Doug stated that the bullet points are representative of the possibilities, but they are not all inclusive. They show examples of activities that might fit into each ILO category. Scott asked the committee to review the ILOs, see if they capture everything and give us feedback. Please send them to your departments to get feedback. Fran stated that these are

so sensible, and she asked what our timeline is to get the process moving. Jane said our hope is to get it endorsed by the Department Chairs, but we didn't have enough time to do it. So the Curriculum Committee is next area, then they could go out to all the constituencies. Ken said it would eventually have to go back to Department Chairs since it is in our contracts. Michelle said since it has to go to Department Chairs at the end, let's consider starting the cycle now. Nikki and R2row stated that the Senate is the last stop for approval since it is a 10+1 issue, but it can go to the Senate for information now. R2row stated that we have identified a process for additional input, refinement and final recommendations for endorsement. Department Chairs will take it to the Senate as a final from the Department Chair. Leslie suggested a timeline with dates. Nikki stated that we brought it here for discussion and she will put it on the Senate and the President's Council agendas for information. Michelle likes the process of giving it to all those areas as an information item for input. Would it be appropriate for Senators to provide input by email? Jane keeps the input and the drafts. Leslie would like the timeline to go out setting when it will close for comments. The timeline is to receive further feedback, then take the ILOs for final approval to Dept. Chairs, Senate, President's Council, and the Board. The goal is to finish the process by the end of the school year. Scott said he would develop a timeline for the next meeting. Sherrean asked if we have an end date in mind. Our team wants to complete this review by the end of the semester. R2row suggested that a written timeline be developed to get input by the end of the semester, and then over the break finalize all the changes, with the hope to receive approval of the President's Council and the Board by mid semester in the spring.

R2row had a comment regarding the 4 quadrants. Some programs have more practice based PLOs that are not included such as: CTE programs regarding licensing and Allied Health or vocational occupations, it seems that the PLOs are not dictated to this area. We should get feedback to see if their learning outcomes will fall under these categories. Jane asked where did they fit before? Leslie said we can discuss at the next meeting with Sherrean's input. Michelle says that they are based on all outcomes not just educational but employer based. Scott said we definitely would like the perspective of the Career Technical areas for areas that are not representative. Phil stated that certification programs are more program learning level outcomes rather than an institutional focus. R2row stated that these programs might have certain PLOs that are dictated by their degree or certificate. Phil says ILOs drive down to PLO and so on, the question is do we map upward or do we map downward? R2row said it could go both ways. Jane asked the same question about our individual classes since we have a lot of job preparation areas and we would fit into Category D. Jane asked to share with departments and give feedback to her via email, and she will compile it.

##### 5. Catalog - Leslie

Leslie wanted to talk about the catalog since we no longer have print versions. She gave us a print copy to see how programs fit and what they look like. Can we look at it from the perspective of our students? The catalog has many errors. Use it as a resource. As we talk about GP, take a critical look at what we have. Do we look at other programs and will they be affected? The question of who owns the content and the process of development is unclear. It doesn't go through curriculum. Jan sends something out, and we review it and that's it. She asked if we have institutional support to help with this? We all need to look at this and help figure out how to make it right. Please review your programs in the newly printed catalog to

check if they have been printed correctly. Further discussion followed about the kinds of errors that have been found in the printed catalog and the source of the errors. Rosa asked if there are errors we need to submit the information to Jan so she can post it. She suggested we first look at the course or program in CurricUNET, then notify Jan with an amendment.

## V. Consent Agenda

*Motion to review and approve all these classes at one time.*

**MSC (N. Dequin/K. Wagman) All in favor. Motion passes.**

### 1. Modification to Existing Courses

- a. BUS 1 Fundamentals of Business
- b. JFT 214 Rescue Systems I Basic Rescue Skills
- c. KIN 39 Fencing
- d. KIN 44A Aerobics - Level 1
- e. KIN 44B Aerobics - Level 2
- f. KIN 44C Aerobics - Level 3
- g. KIN 70A Pilates - Level 1
- h. KIN 70B Pilates - Level 2
- i. KIN 70C Pilates - Level 3
- j. KIN 71A Self-Defense - Level 1
- k. KIN 71B Self-Defense - Level 2
- l. KIN 71C Self-Defense - Level 3
- m. MATH 235 Integrated Algebra
- n. WTRM 201 Introduction to Water, Wastewater Technology
- o. WTRM 202 Beginning Water, Wastewater, Distribution Math
- p. WTRM 203 Introduction to Electrical and Instrumentation Processes
- q. WTRM 204 Motors and Pumps, Operation and Maintenance
- r. WTRM 205 Water Distribution 1
- s. WTRM 206 Beginning Water Treatment Plant Operation
- t. WTRM 207 Beginning Wastewater Treatment Operations
- u. WTRM 208 Water Distribution 2
- v. WTRM 209 Advanced Water Treatment Plant Operation
- w. WTRM 211 Advanced Wastewater Treatment Plant Operation
- x. WTRM 212 Applied Hydraulics
- y. WTRM 213 Beginning Wastewater Collection
- z. WTRM 214 Laboratory Analysis for Water, Wastewater
- aa. WTRM 217 Water Use Efficiency Practitioner
- bb. WTRM 232 Advanced Water Distribution
- cc. WTRM 233 Water Conservation
- dd. WTRM 234 Industrial Wastewater and Stormwater Management
- ee. WTRM 290 Occupational Work Experience/Water/Wastewater Technology

*Discussion: None*

### 2. Update to Existing Program

- a. Cosmetology, AS Degree
- b. Cosmetology, Certificate of Achievement

*Discussion: None*

## **VI. New Business (Begins on page 14 of Curriculum Summary)**

*Motion to approve first reading of JLE 215.*

**MSD (S. Sandler/N. Dequin) – Tabled.**

*Motion to table all the JLE courses and come back when Doug has the information available.*

**MSC (S. Sandler/N. Dequin) – All in favor. Motion passes.**

2. New Course – First Reading
  - a. JLE 215 Tactical Patrol Rifle Instructor's Course
  - b. JLE 232 Child Advocacy
3. New Course – Second Reading
  - a. JLE 209 Explorer Academy
  - b. JLE 233 Field Training Program-SAC

*Motion to review and approve the KIN 83A, KIN 83B and KIN 83C.*

**MSC (K. Wagman/F. Lozano) – All in favor. Motion passes.**

- c. KIN 83A Karate - Beginning
- d. KIN 83B Karate - Intermediate
- e. KIN 83C Karate - Advanced

Discussion: Ken stated that everything looked straightforward for lab courses, and he even looked up the numbers.

*Motion to review and approve the KIN 122A, KIN 122B and KIN 122C.*

**MSC (D. Acterman/K. Wagman) – All in favor. Motion passes.**

- f. KIN 122A Beach Volleyball - Beginning
- g. KIN 122B Beach Volleyball - Intermediate
- h. KIN 122C Beach Volleyball - Advanced

Discussion: Ken stated that everything looked good again.

*Motion to remove the JLE 215 course from the table and review for approval.*

**MSC (K. Wagman/J. Maringer-Cantu) – All in favor. Motion passes.**

Discussion: Doug said that there was only one SLO listed regarding a lesson plan and that the course had a lot more to it than stated in that one outcome. I didn't feel like it captured the curriculum listed in the course since it said that the intention was to create lesson plans or to create one lesson plan. Sherrean wanted to know if she should take it back to Libby or just to refer to the minutes. Doug stated that he reviewed the other ones, and they were more comprehensive. Michelle appreciates the attention to this area. Jane stated that the justifications said consolidate the SLOs, and Nikki said that it is a 1-unit course, and a 3-unit course generally has 3 outcomes. Sherrean said that this is an instructor's course. Doug stated that should it say "create and present lessons plans" instead of one lesson plan. Sherrean said it makes sense. Doug said the other courses were on "target".

*Motion revised to approve the first reading of JLE 215 with the following adjustments: addition of the letter "s" to lesson plan and remove the "a".*

**MSC (D. Acterman/K. Wagman) – All in favor. Motion passes with above adjustments.**

- a. JLE 215 Tactical Patrol Rifle Instructor's Course

*Motion to review and approve the JLE 232, JLE 209 and JLE 233.*

**MSC (D. Acterman/D. Chavez) – All in favor. Motion passes.**

2. New Course – First Reading

- b. JLE 232 Child Advocacy

3. New Course – Second Reading

- a. JLE 209 Explorer Academy

- b. JLE 233 Field Training Program-SAC

Discussion: Doug stated that they all do have single outcomes and they looked fine, so there are no issues. Leslie asked Sherrean if she had any issues, and she said they looked good.

**VII. Adjournment at 4:24pm by N. Dequin.**