**Friday, April 24, 2020**

**1:00 – 3:00 pm PST**

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE**

***Minutes Considered Draft Until Approved***

|  |
| --- |
| **Curriculum Committee Members****\*Non-voting members** |
| Jennifer Bailey | Present | Jennifer Burlison | Present | Michael Dennis | Absent |
| Levi Gill | Present | Chris Lancaster | Present | Mike Peterson | Present |
| Wendy Riggs | Present | Justine Shaw | Present | Sean Thomas (ch) | Present |
| Angelina Hill\* | Present | Cameron Papp\* | Present |  |  |

**Eureka Campus: SS202 Del Norte Campus: E2 ConferZoom:** [**https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/740724521**](https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/740724521)

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**2.1 General Public Comments**

Chair Sean Thomas called for public comments. There was none.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**3.1 Approve minutes from March 13, 2020**

It was motioned and seconded (Sean Thomas / Jennifer Burlison) to approve minutes from 03/13/2020 as amended.

**4. ACTION ITEMS**

**4.1 Program Revision: CIS Networking AS (Daniel Calderwood & Chris Romero)**

**Discussion:** Chair Thomas discussed, in general, discovering new challenges with eLumen and program revisions. Chris Romero discussed how the program has gone under significant changes as noted within the POR. Due to the dissolution of the Database course, amendments to coursework with program requirements were made. Programming sequence is also a significant change due to changes in the industry and resulting changes in curriculum to provide students with the best opportunity of success within the program and the industry. Justine Shaw commented that the work put into the program appears great also appears to be geared toward student success. Jennifer Burlison questioned the course sequencing (i.e. CIS 31 before 30). Chris Romero responded that the CISCO curriculum changes resulted in CIS 30 not being rigorous as it was before. Therefore, students ultimately be more successful by taking 31 before 30 because it offers them a more solid foundation. Students can take 30 subsequently without any hindrance to their program completion and understanding. Jenifer Burlison also noted that the restrictive electives have been removed & Chris Romero confirms.

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Sean Thomas / Jennifer Burlison) to approve agenda item 4.1 with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y |  Y |

**4.2 Program Revision: CIS Networking CA (Daniel Calderwood & Chris Romero)**

**Discussion:** Chris Romero again notes the sequence changes to the program similar to the degree program. Chris Romero notes the error of inclusion of CIS 37 & 33 & 18, which should not be in the certificate. Additionally, students should be getting programming and networking experience/education with certificate and then move on to more advanced courses for the degree.

**Action:** Following Discussion, it was moved and seconded (Levi Gill / Sean Thomas) to approve agenda item 4.2 with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**4.3 Program Deactivation: Solar Thermal Technician CR (Derek Glavich)**

**Discussion:** Derek notes that, for the last 3-4 years, courses associated with the certificate have been under-enrolled. Derek further comments that type of technology does not necessarily fit into the department’s pedagogy goals. Previously, attempts have been made to alter/adjust courses to see if that would increase enrollment. However, these efforts have not been successful. Derek clarifies that this program is confusing because of the “solar” term within the title. But, that this program is not relevant toward utilizing solar panels to harness electricity and is instead about using solar power to create hot water.

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Sean Thomas / Levi Gill) and to approve agenda item 4.3 with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**4.4 Course Revision: DRAMA-30B Acting II (Leira Satlof)**

**Discussion:** George Potamianos represented Leira as she was unable to attend. George noted that Leira addressed comments in eLumen to which Levi confirms. Justine Shaw mentioned that the objectives & CLO’s should be numbered. All Representative learning tasks need “in & out of class” designation and “legacy data” from “assessment tasks” should be changed.

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Levi Gill / Jennifer Burlison) to approve agenda item 4.4 with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Sean Thomas / Levi Gill) to approve prerequisite with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**4.5 Course Revision w/DE: ENGL-32 Creative Writing – Poetry (Ruth Rhodes)**

**Discussion:** Chair Thomas mentioned that the English courses are receiving a full review because they were pending prior to suspension. Ruth commented that ENGL 32 & 33 was revised to add DE addendum, update textbooks and remove the ENGL 150 advisory. Justine questioned whether we should also have objectives numbered. Chari Thomas confirmed. Jennifer Burlison questioned about the UC/CSU transferability of course and noted that it should be transferable to both. Ruth commented that it’s not on the old COR as transferrable to UC. Burlison noted that the textbook needs to be published within the past 5 years for transferability and perhaps a note can be entered that the 2016 publication year is the most recent text. Wendy Riggs commented that DE Addenda looks great.

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Levi Gill / Jennifer Burlison) to approve agenda item 4.5 with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Levi Gill / Mike Peterson) to approve the **DE Addendum** with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**4.6 Course Revision w/DE: ENGL-33 Creative Writing – Prose (Ruth Rhodes)**

**Discussion:** Ruth mentioned the need to number objectives. Jennifer noted the UC transferability potential as discussed above for ENGL 32.

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Levi Gill / Jennifer Burlison) to approve agenda item 4.6 with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
|  Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Levi Gill / Mike Peterson) to approve the **DE Addendum** with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
|  Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**4.7 [TABLED] Course Revision: PHIL-16 Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion (John Johnston)**

**Discussion:** At the author’s request, this proposal was tabled prior to the meeting. It will return to a future meeting.

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Levi Gill / Jennifer Burlison) to approve agenda item 4.7 with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**4.8 Course Revision w/DE: HE-1 Health Education (Marla Gleave)**

**Discussion:** Marla Gleave discussed that the general update had come through within past few years but DE needed updating, so Maggie and Wendy worked together on updating the DE addenda. Otherwise, the revision includes a general altercation of language. Justine Shaw noted that RLO’s need “in & out” of class. Burlison noted that they are in there but they are within the sentence instead of at the end of the sentence. Chair Thomas noted that this revision likely came through before CR was working toward including that language for each RLO. With reference to CR GE Area B, Marla discussed that they were trying to remember historical content regarding when the CR GE for this course disappeared or if it was never included. Marla further noted that it is included as a graduation requirement for many colleges. Other colleges include this course in their GE Area E, which we don’t have. Marla added that historically there have been conversations about how to include this course in CR’s GE. It was ultimately concluded that it likely fit best under Social Sciences. Marla communicated with other colleges to see what they did some have included it in their Social Science GE area in addition to other HE courses. Marla further discussed the differences of other schools and their HE courses with comparison to their GE areas. Chair Thomas commented that, as a committee, we need to decide if our overall work supports the students and the mission of the College. Chair Thomas called on committee members for additional comments. LEVI noted that this course seems on par with other courses approved for this area. Bailey questioned about whether we could include it with Area E for UC. Marla clarified that it is only being considered for the local GE pattern. Chair Thomas opened the discussion for the DE Addenda. There was none.

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Levi Gill / Jennifer Burlison) to approve agenda item 4.8 with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Levi Gill / Jennifer Burlison) to approve for **CR GE Area B** with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Levi Gill / Mike Peterson) to approve the **DE Addendum** with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**4.9 DE Addendum: CHEM-2 Introduction to Chemistry (Anthony Satori)**

**Discussion:** Wendy Riggs represented the author for the DE addendum as she was heavily involved in that process and noted that the DE modality is prepared to be offered for the 2020 Summer Session. Chair Thomas noted that even if there is not a DE Addendum for summer, it can be offered online so long as it is retroactively approved by December 30th. Shaw noted that the class doesn’t have an IMF but that there may be items students have to purchase. Riggs noted that it’s linked to the outline via WebAdvisor and that it’s similar to a textbook as opposed to an IMF. Burlison asked that about assessment via proctored exams. Riggs clarified that it’s left as an option for faculty to include but it’s not a requirement. Riggs added that the issue may be with how to communicate to students if there is a proctored exam as they would have to be notified of the requirement up front so they can make an informed decision about the course.

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Levi Gill / Jennifer Burlison) to approve the **DE Addendum** with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**4.10 DE Addendum: BIOL-2 Microbiology (Diqui LaPenta)**

**4.11 DE Addendum: BIOL-6 Human Anatomy (Wendy Riggs)**

**Discussion:** There was none.

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Levi Gill / Jennifer Burlison) to **batch** **vote** agenda items 4.10 & 4.11 with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Sean Thomas) to approve the **DE Addenda** with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**4.12 DE Addendum: MATH-252 Math Lab, Non-Credit Version (Amber Buntin)**

**4.13 DE Addendum: MATH-52 Math Lab (Amber Buntin)**

**Discussion:** Amber discussed including the DE addenda to the math labs in order to support students during the summer term. The method of accounting student hours has been adjusted because it is drop-in and it will now have a DE modality. Amber further noted that she addressed Wendy’s suggestions and updated the DE addenda.

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Levi Gill / Mike Peterson) to **batch** **vote** agenda items 4.12 & 4.13 with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Levi Gill / Jennifer Burlison) to approve the **DE Addenda** with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**4.14 DE Addendum: MATH-101 Elementary & Intermediate Algebra Review (Amber Buntin)**

**Discussion:** Amber discussed that the course is offered as a CHEM 2 support course regarding mathematical applications and the DE addenda addresses the ability to offer this class to students during the summer session. Burlison asked for clarification about MATH 304 & 204 regarding whether they will be support courses for CHEM 2. Amber clarified that there is a significant hour requirement for MATH 304 & 204 so they will be utilizing 101 since it requires less hours. Amber further noted that MATH 252 will also be a support course and there are comments in WebAdvisor for students to read regarding which support course to enroll in based on their section.

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Levi Gill / Jennifer Burlison) to approve the **DE Addendum** with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**5.0 DISCUSSION**

**5.1 DE Addendum**

ChairThomas sated that the discussion items presented to the committee can move from discussion to an action item because there is a sense of urgency/emergency given the current pandemic situation and the need to have blanket addenda approvals. Chair Thomas noted that he and Wendy Riggs collaborated on the DE Addendum. Further, shared governance requires that the committee review the item and provides the committee the opportunity to vote on it, but Chair Thomas added that he doesn’t want anyone to feel pressure if committee members are not prepared to vote on the items presented. Riggs stated that, due to the potential of having to move all classes online, there tends to be misleading components of the DE addendum in terms of how faculty responded to questions. Given this, the legality of DE addendum was reviewed. Riggs noted that there are two primary considerations. Number one being regular, effective contact and meaningful engagement with students attending online class. Moreover, when creating the DE addendum, they didn’t want to limit faculty on how to provide meaningful contact. The second consideration is accessibility requirements. Instead of utilizing a check-box approach, they wanted faculty to describe how they will offer accessibility to students with the understanding that the faculty will have full support. Finally, Riggs added that the DE addendum works to clarify the rules and requirements. Chair Thomas added that there is a third consideration, which is also an implied requirement that the learning outcomes need to be addressed for this modality. Chair Thomas commented that many things have evolved since CR last canonized DE addendum, which began in 2012/2013. And, as technology and pedagogy have evolved, the definitions/categories of DE are simply whether they are face-to-face or online. And, it is not consistent with the state to discriminate types of online modalities. Chair Thomas stated that what they are presenting is consistent with what the state discusses. CR primarily rests DE with the DE Committee and have been sending it to the senate but the Curriculum Committee needs to engage with DE addenda in a meaningful way so that we are not “rubber stamping” approvals. There has been a system, language and process issue/breakdown with DE addenda. Moreover, due to the pandemic, the Curriculum Committee has had to become more familiar with DE addenda and evaluating/reviewing them. Chair Thomas stated that Riggs did a full DE addendum and they both worked throughout the revision process with other stakeholders. Chair Thomas opened up the floor for questions and comments for committee members.

Levi Gill questioned as to how the check marks for the DE modalities in item #3 would be utilized. Chair Thomas noted that the purpose is to offer faculty an option to add comments about their modality preference or concern and it would be way for them to “remove” a modality from the DE addendum. Chair Thomas noted that the idea of the addendum is to make it more dialectical among the stages of presenting, interacting and authoring.

Riggs commented that there are best practices but not necessarily one correct way to complete the DE addenda. This form is meant to provide different disciplines and faculty with viable options that work for them but still guides them toward best practices. Chair Thomas added that the purpose of this is to make it easier for committee members to engage in and have a meaningful review of the DE addenda so that they are not simply “rubber-stamped” approvals.

Gill questioned if the modality language is new? Chair Thomas answered that the language is what has been passed down by the senate. Gill questioned the use of item #3 with regard to the use of posing the item in the “negative” when checking a box to indicate that would be the modality faculty prefer not to use as opposed to pose the item in the “positive.” Angelina Hill responded that the purpose or idea of using the negatives is to ultimately provide faculty with more flexibility. Gill concluded that, after the explanation provided, his current understanding of the DE Addendum is different from his original reaction to it and supports the new DE Addendum.

Chair Thomas concludes that this will be a culture shift, but confirms that this change is moving toward best practice. Chair Thomas added that the job of the committee is to make sure faculty are able to adhere to legalities regarding DE teaching capabilities.

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Levi Gill / Jennifer Burlison) to move agenda discussion item 5.1 to an action item with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Levi Gill / Jennifer Burlison) to approve agenda item 5.1 with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**5.2 Correspondence Education**

Chair Thomasnoted thatwe are over time, but this is extremely important and we need to review this item. It is pertinent to approve the emergency modality for the jail and Pelican Bay Prison for the Correspondence Education given the current pandemic situation. We have received emergency guidance from the Chancellor to approve blanket correspondence Education. DE and CE were previously linked in the past but DE has fallen through the cracks with Title 5. Currently, there is no language within Ed. Code to discuss CE. We are using the federal & ACCJC’s guidelines, but Ed. Code is working toward making definitional changes to include CE. Chair Thomas continued by stating that Rory and Margaret brought this topic to his attention due to current pandemic situation, which is especially crucial with for prisons/jails. Moreover, other colleges are looking at similar changes to allow for CE. The intention of CE is that it would be for emergency provisions. For example, for courses offered in the jail, other colleges are looking to add a noncredit class specifically for inmates who are in solitary confinement. CR is not currently looking at that as an option but may in the future. If the CE is approved by December 30, Margaret will be able to schedule courses in summer for the jails. Chair Thomas noted that Rory informed him it won’t be utilized in the summer for Pelican Bay Prison, but they may utilize it in the fall. Chair Thomas discussed each item on the CE form and its purpose.

Gill noted two points of topic. The first topic was that it’s reasonable to create documentation to regulate curriculum. The second topic was whether or not item #4 falls under curriculum, further noted that item #5 clearly does with regard to accessibility and ADA materials. Chair Thomas noted that Gill made a good point and agreed that item #4 does not fall within curriculum definitions. Burlison agreed with Gill as well and added that student services is more of an administration role as opposed to faculty. Consequently, Chair Thomas removed item #5 from the CE document.

Burlison requested an example to be provided with regard to correspondence modality as it relates to the regular and effective requirements as discussed for DE addenda. Chair Thomas replied that there could be weekly mailing between the student and the faculty member. Chair Thomas added however, that there is an ongoing dialogue regarding CE and accessibility.

Gill discussed his current utilization of CE with Pelican Bay students and there tends to be a two week lag time between communications. Gill then asked what the regulations would be taken the correspondence time between parties. Chair Thomas replied that regular and effective contact can vary with definition or faculty, especially without local policy. Title 5 makes it clear that regular and effective contact definition is up to academic interpretation and we need to maintain flexibility.

Gill questioned, if by creating the CE document, are we by default creating correspondence education. Chair Thomas answered no. We are creating a workflow for the curriculum process and we want to avoid pedagogical overreach so that faculty can express academic freedom.

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Levi Gill / Jennifer Burlison) to move agenda discussion item 5.2 to an action item with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**Action:** Following discussion, it was moved and seconded (Levi Gill / Jennifer Burlison) to approve agenda item 5.1 with the following roll call vote.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Burlison* | *Dennis* | *Gill* | *Lancaster* | *Peterson* | *Shaw* | *Thomas (ch)* |
| Y | - | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

**6.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS AND OPEN FORUM**

**6.1 General Announcements and Open Forum**

Chair Thomas noted that the Curriculum Committee meeting in May is cancelled since the committee was able to address and resolve final important business during this meeting.

**6.0 ADJOURNMENT**

Gill Moves to adjourn the meeting and Jennifer Burlison seconds the motion. Chair Sean Thomas adjourns the meeting at 3:40 p.m.
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