

**REDWOODS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**  
**Minutes of the Meeting of the Curriculum Committee**

Eureka: 7351 Tompkins Hill Road, SSA 202

**Meeting Date: September 8, 2017**

**Members Present:** Angelina Hill (Ex-Officio), Sean Thomas, Steve Brown, Nicole Bryant Lescher, Jennifer Burlison, Gary Sokolow.

**Members Absent:** Michelle Haggerty, Marla Gleave, Dave Bazard (Ex-Officio)

**1. Call to Order:** Curriculum Committee Chair, Sean Thomas, called the meeting to order at 1:02 pm.

**2. Introductions & Public Comment:** None.

**3. Approval of the Minutes:** Gary Sokolow moved to approve the minutes of the May 12, 2017 meeting, seconded by Jennifer Burlison. There being no objections, the minutes were approved as written.

**4. Action Items**

**4.1 Course Revision: CT-30 Solar Thermal Design and Installation – Derek Glavich**

Gary Sokolow [M], Jennifer Burlison [2<sup>nd</sup>] Following discussion, the motion to approve was passed by the following roll call vote:

<i>Brown</i>	<i>Bryant Lescher</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Gleave</i>	<i>Haggerty</i>	<i>Sokolow</i>

Discussion: Derek Glavich is in discussion with the instructor about student confusion re: sequencing, since the content of CT-31 comes earlier in the sequence than CT-30. If the department decides to renumber these courses to be more clearly in sequence, Derek wonders how soon that change would be effective. Courtney Loder responded that if the proposals to change course numbering came to the curriculum committee by December 2017, they would almost certainly be effective next Fall.

Derek Glavich further asked about some of the feedback re: aligning representative learning tasks with outcomes. Following discussion, he decided to take more time to revise and return to a later meeting

Vote to table:

Steve Brown [M], Gary Sokolow [2<sup>nd</sup>] the motion to table proposal 4.1, which was passed by the following roll call vote:

<i>Brown</i>	<i>Bryant Lescher</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Gleave</i>	<i>Haggerty</i>	<i>Sokolow</i>
Y	Y	Y	-	-	Y

**4.2 Course Revision: BT-16 Word Processing I – Barbara Jaffari**

Gary Sokolow [M], Steve Brown [2<sup>nd</sup>] Following discussion, the motion to approve was passed by the following roll call vote:

<i>Brown</i>	<i>Bryant Lescher</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Gleave</i>	<i>Haggerty</i>	<i>Sokolow</i>
Y	Y	Y	-	-	Y

Discussion:

#### 4.3 Course Revision: BT-17 Word Processing II – Barbara Jaffari

Gary Sokolow [M], Steve Brown [2<sup>nd</sup>] Following discussion, the motion to approve was passed by the following roll call vote:

<i>Brown</i>	<i>Bryant Lescher</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Gleave</i>	<i>Haggerty</i>	<i>Sokolow</i>
Y	Y	Y	-	-	Y

Discussion:

#### 4.4 Degree Revision: Agriculture, General A.S. Degree – Franz Rulofson

Steve Brown [M], Nicole Bryant Lescher [2<sup>nd</sup>] Following discussion, the motion to approve was passed by the following roll call vote:

<i>Brown</i>	<i>Bryant Lescher</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Gleave</i>	<i>Haggerty</i>	<i>Sokolow</i>
Y	Y	Y	-	-	Y

Discussion: Nicole Bryant Lescher asks about the units required for the major (42-43); and asks about how free students are to choose GE courses. Franz Rulofson replies that 2-3 courses will double count for GE, and for the remaining areas students are free to choose from the local GE pattern.

Jennifer Burlison brings up the issue of student confusion with so many frequent changes to the degree requirements. Franz replies that he teaches a section of GUID-215 each spring where he advises AG students and helps them decide which catalog they want to follow. Jennifer clarifies that the policy re: catalog rights stipulates that students can graduate under the catalog in which they started, or under which they finished--choosing something in between is not an option.

Jennifer Burlison further commented that many AG students in particular get lost/caught between catalogs, which might delay their graduation. Franz commented that in some cases like that, other courses a student has taken that are similar to a requirement they haven't met can be handled via course substitution.

Courtney Loder asks about how they keep up with assessment when the degree changes so frequently. Franz replied that the PLOs rarely change, and are able to remain stable for assessment.

#### 4.5 Dual Enrollment: CIS-12 Programming Fundamentals (Fortuna HS) – Chris Romero

Steve Brown [M], Nicole Bryant Lescher [2<sup>nd</sup>] Following discussion, the motion to approve was passed by the following roll call vote:

<i>Brown</i>	<i>Bryant Lescher</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Gleave</i>	<i>Haggerty</i>	<i>Sokolow</i>
Y	Y	Y	-	-	Y

Discussion: Represented by Dean of CTE Erin Wall.

Sean Thomas reviewed the communication from Chris Romero, where he commented that the questions raised during the May curriculum meeting when it was tabled were probably best addressed by Dual Enrollment experts Erin Wall and Nicole Bryant Lescher.

Erin Wall explains: The priority is to target underrepresented students and/or students who are not likely to be college bound. Right now we are focusing on CTE pathways that will bring those students to CR. Fortuna HS has a high population of hispanic students, and CR data shows that 23% of Hispanic CR students come from Fortuna HS, and historically they assess into pre-collegiate level coursework. The research on Dual Enrollment shows that students who participate in high school enter college with higher assessment scores. Based on local discussion and data analysis, we have defined students not likely to be college bound as those with a high school GPA between 2.0-2.6.

Nicole Bryant Lescher asks whether this course at Fortuna HS overlaps or encroaches upon an AP class. Erin Wall confirms that it does not; FHS doesn't offer an AP Computer Science course. The plan at Fortuna HS is for this to be part of a Computer/Multimedia pathway sequence.

Sean Thomas adds: this committee gets hamstrung by being limited to vote up or down on what's in this specific document, when there is a lot going on outside of this document. In conversation within the AS, there appears to be an institutional gap because we do not always have data to help support these decisions, or assess progress/quality of the courses when taught at local high schools. It's important to voice outward to the Academic Senate and other bodies that this committee feels tension over Dual Enrollment proposals because we aren't always sure what we're approving when we approve them (or don't).

Angelina Hill clarifies that the audit findings that lost us apportionment were not related to the appropriateness of the courses we were teaching, but due to the agreements we created with high schools not containing all the required information. Also, most of the demand for these courses are coming from the high schools.

Sean Thomas comments that, based on the session we attended at Curriculum Institute, Dual Enrollment can look very different on different campuses. His concern is that the administration and the faculty at CR get on the same page as to what Dual Enrollment AT CR looks like.

Courtney Loder asks for clarification re: the bureaucratic/routing process for these forms. Erin Wall confirmed that each Dual Enrollment form is approved for a specific academic year (which is stated on the form). If an agreement does not return to the Curriculum Committee for renewal for another year, the original agreement becomes inactive at the start of the next academic year. Courtney also suggests that these proposals get routed through the Dual Enrollment Coordinator in addition to the Division Dean, similar to the process for Distance Education proposals.

Sean Thomas comments about how in his past on the committee with Distance Education and Dual Enrollment proposals, there is trust in the approval from the coordinator over those areas for the larger justification as to why a course is being offered via that modality. In conversation with the Academic Senate, there seems to be confusion about who has responsibility for questioning the validity or need for them. Sean clarifies that our charge as a committee is to vote on this specific proposal, and not on the institutional ramifications of the proposal--though sometimes there is an expectation that we are, or should.

Steve Brown asks about logistics about when proposals need to be approved in order for there to be time for the schools to implement them during their schedule. Erin Wall explains that can be a complicated question to answer, since there are agreements that need to be drafted between CR and the high school districts outside of the curriculum process; she is working on clarifying those steps and timing moving forward.

## **5. Discussion**

### **5.1 Updated Inactivation Form – Courtney Loder**

It was decided that the Dual Enrollment section of the form is moot, per the discussion about Dual Enrollment re: agenda item 4.5.

### **5.2 Updated Curriculum Routing Chart – Courtney Loder**

It was decided to change all the deadlines listed at noon to be at 5pm on their respective days.

### **5.3 Training for Curriculum Committee Members – Sean Thomas & Courtney Loder**

Sean Thomas and Courtney Loder explained that the streamlining of processes at the Chancellor's includes returning a fair amount of responsibility to local Curriculum Committees; with faster, automated approval at the state level it's more important than ever for local committees to make sure the curriculum they approve is appropriate for college-level instruction, etc. We will likely have continuing conversation about important topics related to this as they arise.

### **5.4 Prep for Accreditation Visit – Angelina Hill**

Angelina Hill oriented the committee re: what to expect during the Accreditation visit in October.

## **6. Announcements and Open Forum**

None.

**7. Adjournment:** On motion by Steve Brown, seconded by Nicole Bryant Lescher, the meeting was adjourned at 3:03 p.m.