

**Friday, November 8, 2019**

**Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Curriculum Committee**

**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/947088431**](https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/947088431)

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

**Members Absent:**

1. **Call to Order**

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

**2. Public Comment**

2.1 Members of the audience are invited to make comments regarding any subject appropriate to the Curriculum Committee

none.

**3. Approval of Minutes**

3.1 Approval of minutes from October 25, 2019

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

**4. Action Items**

**4.1 Course Revision: HO-170C North Coast Paramedic 3 – Doug Boileau**

 [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 | Y |

Discussion:

Ron Waters commented that eLumen made it much easier to involve Associate Faculty in reviewing curriculum.

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

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

Discussion:

**4.2 Course Revision: HO-170D North Coast Paramedic 4 – Doug Boileau**

 [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 | Y |

Discussion:

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

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

Discussion:

**4.3 Course Revision: GUID-252 Communication through Adapted Art – Trish Blair**

 [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 | Y |

Discussion:

**4.4 Course Revision, with DE: HIST-21 World History: 1500CE to Present – Will Meriwether**

 [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 | Y |

Discussion:

Sean Thomas raised a question about some items in the concepts area and whether they are concepts or topics (e.g. Age of Revolution 1750-1918). Discussion ensued about the listing of dates for certain items; consensus was to leave these items as written.

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

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

Discussion:

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

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

Discussion:

**4.5 Course Revision: DA-154 Dental Assisting Materials and Duties – Hillary Reed**

 [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 | Y |

Discussion:

Hillary Reed explained that the Dental Assisting program went through both national and regional accreditation visits last year, which yielded recommendations that are being incorporated in this course revision, and others still being drafted (e.g., additional course objectives, math advisory, etc.).

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

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

Discussion:

**5. Discussion**

5.1 Combining Distance Ed Proposals with COR Updates

Levi Gill asks, if we do this moving forward, if it would be better to have a DE representative attend these meetings to serve as a subject area expert. Sean Thomas comments that he's aware of some discussion happening among DE folks re: the way we handle DE and curriculum.

The DE Addendum as it stands now is written to make clear that DE instruction meets all the state and federal policy requirements for DE, but the current process doesn't allow for much pedagogical discussion about what instruction looks like in DE environments.

Sean's personal view as chair is that he'd like to see DE integrated more fully into deliberations around this table. Knowing all the work that Lisa has put in over the years, and seeing the work that Wendy is doing now, it seems to make more sense to have DE consultation involved in earlier stages of the workflow for course development, vs. performing as a gatekeeper for federal requirements.

Jennifer Burlison asks if proposals with DE can be weighted "heavier" than others for purposes of POD reviewing assignments and agenda size (they used to be separate agenda items).

Justine Shaw comments that perhaps there could be different workflows in the future for new DE proposals vs. renewing existing--new proposals could be routed in such a way as to have more contact with DE coordinator earlier in the process. Courtney Loder believes this is technically possible, and could be discussed in the future.

5.2 Expedited process for "administrative changes"? (changing only items on COR that do not impact classroom content; e.g., certain MIS Codes, accounting method, etc.)

Courtney Loder will create a list of COR items that could be included in a workflow like this that can be an action item at the next meeting.

5.3 eLumen Feedback/Q&A

**6. Announcements and Open Forum**

Levi Gill asked to revisit conversations about AB705, particularly re: the listing of Math courses as pre/co-requisites or advisories that likely won't exist next year. Levi also commented that often these courses get listed as a form of shorthand based on the perceived "level" of math, when the actual concepts covered may not be relevant to the course in question.

Courtney Loder commented that the Limitations on Enrollment area could be used to specify the math skills/concepts needed to be successful without referencing a specific course.

Jennifer Burlison, playing devil's advocate, posits that counselors and advisors aren't necessarily familiar with the math skills that would be listed or be able to explain them to students.

Levi Gill responds that the vast majority of conversations he has around this topic are related to arithmetic and other elementary/secondary math skills.

Sean Thomas observed that we've always had a problem with improper and inexact fitment with course pre-requisites. AB705 has removed the archaic coursework that propped things up, but the problem has always existed. AB705 shifted a paradigm from pre-req sequencing to concurrent support, but we have a few years of curriculum development ahead of us to get it all in place.

Levi Gill brings up a new topic: Reviewing PODs

When there's 6 course proposals from the same department/author, but my POD only includes two of them, it becomes harder to catch thematic issues that might apply to all of those proposals, and creates the possibility for authors to receive inconsistent feedback.

Justine Shaw suggested that Courtney could add language to her revision reminder email for authors saying something like "if you have multiple similar proposals and get a comment on one that would be relevant to others, please be sure to address that issue in each proposal where it may occur." Courtney Loder agreed to add language like this in the future.

Jennifer Burlison asks about alerting the rest of the committee for things that could use extra attention. Sean replies that the best way to do this while staying compliant with Brown Act is for the person who notices an issue to contact Sean, who can then send communication out to the full committee if necessary.

Sean Thomas feels that something is lacking in the review, discussion and voting process. We used to have paper documents in front of us, but with the changes in our process and infrastructure we should make sure that our practices adjust accordingly to maintain integrity.

**7. Adjournment**  [M], [2nd]
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