**Regular Meeting of the Curriculum Committee (Friday, September 27, 2019)**

**1:00 - 3:00 p.m.  
Eureka: 7351 Tompkins Hill Road, SS 202  
Del Norte: 883 W. Washington Boulevard, Room E2  
ConferZoom: https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/940059694**

**Members Present:** Jennifer Burlison, Michael Dennis, Chris Lancaster, Mike Peterson, Justine Shaw, Angelina Hill (Ex Officio), Courtney Loder (Ex Officio)

**Members Absent:** Levi Gill

**1. Call to Order**

Curriculum Committee Chair, Sean Thomas, called the meeting to order at 1:01 p.m.

**2. Public Comment**

none

**3. Approval of Minutes**

Procedural: 3.1 Approve Minutes from September 13, 2019

[M], [2nd]Following discussion, the minutes were approved as written.

**4. Action Items**

**Action: 4.1 NEW Cert. of Achievement: Graphic Design & Visual Communication**

[M], [2nd]Following discussion, the motion to approve was passed by the following roll call vote:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* |
| Y | Y | - | Y | Y | Y |

Discussion:

Cindy Hooper commended Natalia Margulis for all her hard work in integrating digital media offerings into the art department.

Jennifer Burlison asked why the course sequencing was defined as 6 units per term. George Potamianos replied that Natalia envisioned that sequence to last two years (e.g., for students completing this alongside a degree), though it's possible for students to complete this in one year taking courses full time. All are introductory courses with the exception of ART-77, which should be taken in the final term.

**Action: 4.2 Course Revision: ART-42 Beginning Graphic Design**

[M], [2nd]Following discussion, the motion to approve was passed by the following roll call vote:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* |
| Y | Y | - | Y | Y | Y |

Discussion:

Michael Dennis asked about possible course to course articulation; led to discussion clarifying the role of the Curriculum Committee re: Articulation. The committee doesn't approve anything related to articulation; we use the COR as a mechanism to process articulation requests, and to provide informational updates to the campus.

**[M], [2nd] to approve items 4.3 – 4.10 as a batch. Following discussion, the motion to consider as a batch was passed by the following roll call vote:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* |
| Y | Y | - | Y | Y | Y |

Discussion:

**Action: 4.3 Course Revision: ESL-200 Fundamental English as a Second Language (ESL) - Low Beginning**

**Action: 4.4 Course Revision: ESL-201 Fundamental English as a Second Language (ESL) - High Beginning**

**Action: 4.5 Course Revision: ESL-205 Fundamental Career and Educational Vocabulary for ESL Students**

**Action: 4.6 Course Revision: ESL-207 Fundamental Computer Vocabulary for ESL Students**

**Action: 4.7 Course Revision: ESL-210 Intermediate English as a Second Language (ESL) – Low**

**Action: 4.8 Course Revision: ESL-211 Intermediate English as a Second Language (ESL) - High**

**Action: 4.9 Course Revision: ESL-215 Intermediate Career and Educational Vocabulary for ESL Students**

**Action: 4.10 Course Revision: ESL-217 Intermediate Computer Vocabulary for ESL Students**

[M], [2nd]Following discussion, the motion to approve items 4.3 – 4.10 was passed by the following roll call vote:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* |
| Y | Y | - | Y | Y | Y |

Discussion:

**Action: 4.11 Course Revision: AG-21 Plant Propagation/Production**

[M], [2nd]Following discussion, the motion to approve was passed by the following roll call vote:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* |
| y | y | - | Y | Y | Y |

Discussion:

**Action: 4.12 Course Revision: AG-23 Introduction to Plant Science**

[M], [2nd]Following discussion, the motion to approve was passed by the following roll call vote:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* |
| Y | Y | - | Y | Y | Y |

Discussion:

[M], [2nd]Following discussion, the motion to **renew for CR GE Area A** was passed by the following roll call vote:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* |
| Y | Y | - | Y | Y | Y |

Discussion:

**Action: 4.13 Course Revision: AG-51 Tractor Operation**

[M], [2nd]Following discussion, the motion to approve was passed by the following roll call vote:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* |
| Y | Y | - | Y | Y | Y |

Discussion:

**Action: 4.14 Course Deactivation: AG-44B Agriculture Leadership II**

[M], [2nd]Following discussion, the motion to approve was passed by the following roll call vote:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* |
| Y | Y | - | Y | Y | Y |

Discussion:

**Action: 4.15 Course Revision: ANTH-6 Introduction to Forensic Anthropology**

[M], [2nd]Following discussion, the motion to approve was passed by the following roll call vote:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* |
| Y | Y | - | Y | Y | - |

Discussion:

Justine Shaw explained that this course was mistakenly approved as physical science course for CSU GE; should have been approved for life science. This revision adjusts only the CSU GE proposal to resubmit for the appropriate GE area.

[M], [2nd]Following discussion, the motion to **renew for CR GE Areas A and B** was passed by the following roll call vote:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* |
| Y | Y | - | Y | Y | - |

Discussion:

Michael Dennis asked if this course has a lab. Justine Shaw replied that it doesn't, but a lab would be nice/complimentary. It would be hard to manage another lab offering with the current size of the department. Would make more sense to offer if they had more majors.

**Action: 4.16 Course Revision: ENGL-9 World Literature - Early Modern to 21st Century**

**Action: 4.17 Course Revision: ENGL-10 World Literature: Antiquity to The Early Modern Era**

**Action: 4.18 Course Revision: ENGL-17 American Literature: Beginnings to the Civil War**

**Action: 4.19 Course Revision: ENGL-18 American Literature - Civil War - World War II**

**Action: 4.20 Course Revision: ENGL-60 Introduction to British Literature: Beginnings through the 18th Century**

**Action: 4.21 Course Revision: ENGL-61 Introduction to British Literature: Romanticism to the Present**

Items 4.16 – 4.21 were tabled prior to the meeting at author’s request; these will return to a future meeting after further revision.

**5. Discussion**

**Discussion: 5.1 eLumen Feedback and Discussion**

Courtney Loder asked committee members to share feedback from their experiences as authors and reviewers during the first meeting cycle with eLumen:

* Justine Shaw shared that there was confusion around collaborating on a program proposal with faculty in different disciplines [all faculty need to be associated with the “home” discipline in the proposal in order to work with the proposal; Courtney Loder can adjust the disciplines associated to eLumen faculty accounts when situations like this arise].
* General confusion around automated email notifications. People with multiple roles are confused about which notifications are which kind of review, etc. Committee decided to turn off auto-notifications for the next meeting cycle. [Courtney Loder has submitted a ticket to eLumen asking for notifications to be disabled].
* Jennifer Burlison expressed that it was difficult to review without the same help text that was printed on the old COR Form. Courtney Loder reminded everyone that there is help text available throughout the eLumen COR, but you have to click an icon to see it. Courtney has already provided feedback to eLumen re: the design of this icon, asking them to make it more visible (currently a gray rectangle with three small dots in it).
* Chris Lancaster asked if approved C-ID descriptors are in eLumen. Courtney Loder explained that currently approved descriptors were not part of the initial data import, but finding a way to include this information is on her to-do list. There is a mechanism within the eLumen course workflow to request a new C-ID submission.
* Sean Thomas shared that having comment boxes throughout the COR made it tricky for him to figure out where to put general/global comments about the proposal. Committee discussed the possibility of using the first (Cover Info) comment box for this purpose, but that would require scrolling back up to the top of the proposal after reaching the end. Courtney will look into created a custom box at the end of the COR with the next workflow update.

Courtney Loder shared many of the same observations that were raised by the committee, and recommended a workflow update to address some of these challenges. As part of this update, she recommended the creation of individual eLumen roles for each committee reviewer, which would remove the need to “save vs. submit” when reviewing proposals, and smooth out a lot of the confusion that occurred while reviewing the program proposal on this agenda (where there is no option to save as a draft while reviewing).

**6. Announcements and Open Forum**

**7. Adjournment**

On motion by , seconded by , the meeting was adjourned at 2:25 p.m.