

Friday, October 9, 2020
1:00 – 3:00 pm PST

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Eureka Campus: SS202 Del Norte Campus: E2 ConferZoom: <https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/740724521>

Curriculum Committee Members					
*Non-voting members					
Jennifer Bailey	Present	Jennifer Burlison	Present	Ashley Knowlton	Absent
Chris Lancaster	Present	Jonothan Pace	Present	Mike Peterson	Present
Sean Thomas (ch)	Present	Angelina Hill*	Absent	Philip Mancus*	Absent
Cameron Papp*	Present	Wendy Riggs*	Absent		

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Sean Thomas called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

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

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

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.1 Approve minutes from September 25, 2020

It is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Chris Lancaster) to approve minutes from 09/25/2020 as amended.

Jennifer Burlison comments that, with reference to the Welding Technology courses on page 12, she wishes to include her comment that currently the Counseling and Advising notes are not housed anywhere except for the COR.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION ITEMS

4.1 DE Addenda approved by Distance Education Liaison: AG-27 (Meerae Park), AG-21, 25, 32, 33, 44 & 5 (Franz Rulofson); ART-3A (Shannon Sullivan); CT-81 (Derek Glavich); HE-7 (Michele Schneider); MATH-130, 204, 301, 302, 303 & 304 (Amber Buntin); MATH-10, 25, 45, 50B & 50C (Anthony Luehrs); PE-20 & 23 (Maggie White), PE-12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 36, 80 & 9 (Marla Gleave); REC-60 (Marla Gleave); WORK-220, 221 & 222 (Wendy Butler)



Discussion: There is none.

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Jonathan Pace) to approve the current agenda item with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
-	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-

5. ACTION ITEMS

5.1 CE Addendum: ENGL-32 Creative Writing: Poetry (Ashley Knowlton)

5.2 CE Addendum: ENGL-33 Creative Writing - Prose (Ashley Knowlton)

Discussion: Chair Thomas states that offering this modality for students at Pelican Bay resulted in an unprecedented collaboration of the English Department. Moreover, the content in the addendum is impressive and notes Ashely Knowlton’s excellence in leadership toward this addendum. Finally, the creative writing faculty involved also did excellent work in devising how this modality will be offered.

Action: It is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Mike Peterson) to consider items 5.1 – 5.2 as a batch is passed with the following roll call vote:

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
-	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Mike Peterson / Jennifer Burlison) to approve the **CE Addenda** for items 5.1 – 5.2 with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
-	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-

5.3 Course Deactivation: CIS-100 Basic Computer Skills (Christian Romero)

5.4 Course Deactivation: CT-210 Construction Trades: Introduction to Carpentry (Derek Glavich)

Discussion: Jennifer Burlison asks which Adult Education course would be comparable to CIS-100 for basic computer skills. Amy Berkowitz responds that it is EDUC-207.

Action: It is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Mike Peterson) to consider items 5.3 – 5.4 as a batch is passed with the following roll call vote:

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
-	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-



Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Jonothan Pace) to approve the current agenda items with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
-	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-

5.5 Course Revision w/DE: CT-32 Photovoltaic Design and Installation (Derek Glavich)

Discussion: Derek Glavich questions if he responded to Jennifer Burlison’s questions clearly about the representative learning activities. Jennifer Burlison states that he did and adds that the only other question she had was about if the course is moving a full unit value. Derek Glavich responds yes. He adds that it is a little confusing because the previous version of the course showed an odd value of units (1.7) so, during the course revision, there was an opportunity to adjust the unit value. Derek Glavich concludes that, for this course, students install solar panels on a house and it’s a great lab class.

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Jonothan Pace) to approve the current agenda item with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
-	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Mike Peterson) to approve the **DE Addendum** with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
-	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-

5.6 Course Revision w/DE: CT-72 Electrical Codes and Standards (Derek Glavich)

Discussion: There is none.

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Mike Peterson) to approve the current agenda item with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
-	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Jonothan Pace) to renew the **CT 78A advisory** with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
-	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Mike Peterson) to approve the **DE Addendum** with the following roll call vote.



<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
-	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-

5.7 Course Revision w/DE: MATH-15S Support for Statistics (Jonathan Pace)

Discussion: Jonathan Pace that this revision included heavily involved discussion among faculty regarding the best way to implement this course and the decision was not achieved lightly. Discussions occurred amongst faculty whom have previously taught the course before and during the pandemic. Chair Thomas notes that, at a meeting with the Math Department, a discussion around whether or not the MATH 15S & 30S support courses should be delivered synchronously. His advice to the department was to look to the COR to make an argument for an administrator who may not wish to schedule the course synchronously. Chair Thomas adds that this is an important statement to make publicly due to the seriousness of the discussion within the Math Department. Moreover, Chair Thomas wishes to thank the Math Department for excellent curriculum work and completing this revision, as it is an exemplary product. Jonathan Pace thanks Chair Thomas, Wendy Riggs and Reno Giovannetti for attending the meeting as it was helpful to have everyone’s insight as the Math Department was working through the pedagogical issues. Amber Buntin thanks Wendy Riggs for her guidance.

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Mike Peterson) to approve the current agenda item with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
Y	Y	-	Y	-	Y	-

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Jonathan Pace) to renew the **MATH 15 corequisite** with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
Y	Y	-	Y	-	Y	-

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Mike Peterson) to approve the **DE Addendum** with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
Y	Y	-	Y	-	Y	-

5.8 Course Revision w/DE: MATH-30S Support for College Algebra (Amber Buntin)

Discussion: Chair Thomas wishes to include his previous statements for action item 5.7 for this current action item and for working with Amber Buntin and the Math Department. Jennifer Bailey wishes to confirm that the methods of evaluation have changed, as it seems that they may have substantially. Because of the substantial change, Jennifer Bailey notes that she will be resubmitting the course to Assist even though it’s not GE articulated. Amber Buntin responds that, per Chair Thomas’ request, the



legacy data was adjusted however, Buntin thought that the language was only slightly revised and did not think that major changes occurred. Anthony Luehrs comments that he does not remember specifics for this course, but the upcoming agenda item only had minor revisions to formatting. Chair Thomas presents the active and the revised COR's to the Committee. Chair Thomas notes that there are wording changes and a reduction of one assessment task. Jonathan Pace notes that the CLO's were changed, which also requires a resubmission. Amber Buntin comments that the revisions were necessary because some requirements were not necessarily assessable for the support course in the same way they are for the main course, which was learned after first creating the support course. Jennifer Bailey notes that she is confident that the resubmission will end favorably and that she wanted to ensure to note that it is considered a substantial change. Amber Buntin states that there is no ISBN number or publisher information for open resources, but she did make the recommended changes. Chair Thomas thanks Amber Buntin for the changes and reiterates his gratitude for her work with this revision and DE addendum as it is very meaningful for the institution.

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Mike Peterson) to approve the current agenda item with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
Y	Y	-	Y	-	Y	-

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Mike Peterson) to renew the **MATH 30 corequisite** with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
Y	Y	-	Y	-	Y	-

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Mike Peterson) to approve the **DE Addendum** with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
Y	Y	-	Y	-	Y	-

5.9 Course Revision w/DE: MATH-4 MATLAB Programming (Anthony Luehrs)

Discussion: Chair Thomas thanks Anthony Luehrs for all of his work toward curriculum and notes that he, Luehrs and Wendy Riggs had many email exchanges for these course revisions. Chair Thomas adds that he appreciates all of his colleagues but he especially appreciated working with Anthony as this was the most in-depth he has worked with curriculum outside of his department. Chair Thomas concludes with an apology for Anthony Luehrs for being “grumpy” with him and he wishes to say so publicly because he had a great time working with Luehrs. Anthony Luehrs states that he had a great time doing this curriculum work. Chair Thomas notes with the Committee members that his comments are not meant to sway their vote.



Anthony Luehrs states that he did have one question regarding representative versus required assessment tasks. He notes that the question may be better phrased as to what belongs where in those fields. Specifically, he has a long statement about representative assessment task but, in the required assessment task, there is only mention of a required term paper. Ultimately, the representative and required assessment tasks should be writing programs in and outside of class whereas the term paper is outside of class time. Luehrs continues that he kept the boxes as they were because he believes that these fields are looked at more for external review. However, he asks the committee if he should rearrange or reword them. Chair Thomas asks the Committee if they foresee any issues with what Luehrs is describing. Jennifer Burlison notes that she discussed this on the Curriculum Forum because the response was so succinct that she wanted to be sure about the intended direction. Luehrs states that it was left open intentionally so that it did not become a necessary requirement. He notes that numbers one and two are the same, but he did not want to make them very detailed for the required assessment task. Chair Thomas responds that it is appropriate with consideration for academic freedom such that it is appropriate to note what should be required while allowing faculty to make adjustments when teaching the course. Luehrs notes that was the intention.

Jennifer Burlison notes her appreciation of the methods of instruction section and she felt she could easily understand how the course is handled. Anthony Luehrs states that this is one of his favorite classes to teach. Moreover, he notes that Chris Lancaster commented in the Curriculum Forum regarding revising the catalog description of the course. Luehrs notes that he did not pay much attention to it but, after Lancaster’s suggestion, he re-read it and realized it was not very descriptive so he adjusted it for clarity. Jennifer Bailey asks Luehrs if he saw her comments about C-ID. Luehrs says yes he did and thanks Bailey for her comment. Chair Thomas notes that the authors have a robust explanation for the prerequisites and advisory. Moreover, the work toward GE is exceptional.

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Mike Peterson) to approve the current agenda item with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Jonothan Pace) to renew **CR General Education Area D3** with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Mike Peterson) to renew the **MATH 25 & 30 prerequisites** with the following roll call vote.



<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Chris Lancaster) to renew the **MATH 50A advisory** with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Mike Peterson) to approve the **DE Addendum** with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-

5.10 Course Revision w/DE: MATH-55 Differential Equations (Anthony Luehrs)

Discussion: There is none.

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Chris Lancaster) to approve the current agenda item with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Jonathan Pace) to renew the **MATH 50B prerequisite** with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Jonathan Pace) to approve the **DE Addendum** with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-

5.11 Course Revision w/DE: WORK-201: Work Readiness Skills for the 21st Century (Amy Berkowitz)

Discussion: Amy Berkowitz states that work readiness is one of the most important courses offered in noncredit curriculum and that, to be able to deliver it in various modalities aligns very closely to the purpose of adult education. She adds that this course assists students go gain employment skills such as looking for employment and creating resumes. Berkowitz notes her appreciation for the tremendous support that faculty receive from the Committee. Chair Thomas tells Berkowitz that she is welcome and



adds that Committee members are making extra efforts not simply because of the crisis but also because of the high volume of incoming work.

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Mike Peterson) to approve the current agenda item with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Mike Peterson) to approve the **DE Addendum** with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-

5.12 Course Revision: WORK-228 Ethics & Values (Amy Berkowitz)

Discussion: Jennifer Burlison asks why a DE addendum was not included with this revision. Amy Berkowitz answers that she was instructed to specifically update the course without including the DE addendum.

Action: Following discussion, it is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Jonothan Pace) to approve the current agenda item with the following roll call vote.

<i>Bailey</i>	<i>Burlison</i>	<i>Knowlton</i>	<i>Lancaster</i>	<i>Pace</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Thomas (ch)</i>
Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	-

6.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS

6.1 AP/IB/CLEP: Jennifer Bailey

Chair Thomas informs the Committee that he asked Jennifer Bailey to discuss these matters as there is a lot of information surrounding CLEP and competency based education. Currently, our articulation officer (Bailey) is interfacing with articulation, the academic senate and faculty and, as a committee, we need to provide support and guidance regarding what the articulation officer is advising faculty. Chair Thomas wanted to have this discussion with hopes of discovering what, if anything, the Committee can do to support Bailey’s work.

Jennifer Bailey discusses that currently, there are essentially three standardized tests. We have traditionally honored AP and IB but, what was discovered is that they charts were out of date. Jennifer Bailey has since updated them and she states that she created the cut scores of a minimum of three or higher across the higher education systems. She adds that they needed to be updated because the tests themselves have changed. Specifically, Bailey states that she updated the AP and IB charts with the new tests and created the areas for CR GE, which is in contrast to what we have done as an institution in the past. In the past, CR has awarded course equivalency however, it has been discovered that when students transfer to the CSU system they may not honor



the ART 1A course equivalency that we awarded, for example. To rectify this potential hardship on the student, Bailey notes that she utilizes the CSU template to honor areas instead of course-to-course equivalencies and we may want to consider this with application toward CR GE instead of course-to-course equivalency in addition to awarding the student with six units similar to the CSU system. Jennifer Burlison asks if we have a current chart for CSU. Bailey answers yes and adds that we did not need approval because it is the CSU system. Bailey clarifies that we need to obtain approval for how this will be applied to CR GE. Burlison asks where the charts are located if they are not in the catalog. Bailey answers that they are currently in the catalog.

Jennifer Bailey progresses the discussion to CLEP and states that we do not have, nor have we ever had, a CLEP chart. However, Title 5 states that we are required to honor the CLEP examinations and provide students with credit upon successful completion. Bailey states that she created a CLEP chart that follows CSU guidelines for units and areas of GE utilizing CR GE patterns. She adds that students are negatively affected when we use course-to-course equivalencies instead of GE when they transfer to the university. However, if we provide the student with credit in an area, they are aware that they have not been awarded the course-to-course equivalency. Bailey states that the minimum scores for this chart are also based on what the CSU grants however; she did not complete the UC portion because they are very particular with regard to CLEP. Bailey notes that she met with the Academic Senate and they were not sure where this topic should first be presented, so she is unaware of how to continue this discussion appropriately. Unfortunately, though, our charts are out of date and need to be updated to best serve the students. Moreover, Bailey believes that awarding GE areas instead of course-to-course equivalencies and awarding the total units based off the CSU system is in the best interest of the students.

Jennifer Burlison comments that she has seen the AP and CLEP charts but that she has never seen the IB chart. Jennifer Bailey states that it is currently in the 2019/2020 catalog, specifically page 50. Burlison adds that she has yet to experience a student bring in an IB transcript. Bailey responds that it is somewhat common for students attending McKinleyville High School.

Chair Thomas notes that Angelina Hill has taken the day off but it would be great to get her perspective on where to address this topic. In the past, the English Department has had conversations about cut scores and course-to-course equivalencies. Chair Thomas agrees with Bailey's suggestion and sees its value. However, Chair Thomas is unsure of where this should be addressed without involving Angelina Hill's Office as the next step for the institution. Chair Thomas adds that he is not necessarily confident on how faculty will perceive this shift and it is pertinent for faculty to be able to be a part of the discussions. Chair Thomas asks Bailey what is the timeline or deadline to make a decision and how critical is the deadline. Jennifer Bailey answers that the outdated AP and IB charts can continue to be utilized until the new charts are approved. However, CLEP is going to be voted on by the Chancellor's Office in October so we need to have something in place. Moreover, while we can wait for the AP and IB charts to be approved, the students are negatively impacted when they transfer.



Chair Thomas states that it would be best to add this as a discussion item for the next Curriculum Committee meeting on October 23, 2020. At that point, we would be able to involve Angelina Hill and see about next steps. If the Committee decides to move the discussion item to an action item, we could vote on it at that point and then move it forward to the Academic Senate for a vote. However, Chair Thomas notes that he is uncomfortable moving this topic forward without involving the Vice President of Instruction, Academic Senate and faculty. Chair Thomas' particular concern is that this shift could be met with significant resistance from faculty, so it is of utmost importance to clearly follow protocol and re-address this topic at the next meeting.

Jennifer Bailey comments that she took on this project because no one else had time to complete it. Moreover, using the course-to-course equivalencies is acceptable. The important thing is to get the process started. Chair Thomas notes that, if Title 5 language is approved, there is a strong argument for Bailey's suggestion. However, until then, it is best to collaborate with faculty and administration. Chair Thomas notes Bailey's tremendous work on this subject and that her reasoning for the changes is strong because it would be best for the students. Although, it would not be wise for the Curriculum Committee to make a decision without having collaborative discussion. Bailey agrees and states that re-addressing this subject at the next meeting is a good plan. Jennifer Bailey concludes the discussion by thanking Chair Thomas and the Committee for the time to have this discussion.

6.2 CSU General Education Area F

Chair Thomas states that, from an email exchange with the Chair of the Multicultural Diversity Center (MDC), he is aware that Chris Lancaster sits on the MDC Committee and adds that the Curriculum Committee can benefit from what Lancaster's experience on the MDC. The California State legislature and the CSU system has a new mandate to incorporate General Education (GE) Area F as a graduation requirement. The Governor of California stated that the CSU's are to embrace GE Area F in ethnic studies by the end of this year. Specifications will become concrete however; currently, there is only an FAQ. Moreover, there is an equivalent Assembly Bill for California Community Colleges (CCC) to incorporate a similar GE requirement but the bill is on hold for the time being. The CSU requirement essentially means a de facto requirement for CR to develop material at the CCC to meet this new requirement, which will be implemented in Fall 2021 and applicable for graduation in 2024. CR must decide which of our current courses are similar to Area F for submission. We had the old GE Area E articulation list and there are some CR courses previously approved for that area. Chair Thomas adds that the ethnic studies definition as CSU is narrow. Chair Thomas states that he worked with Cintra in Native American Studies to include CSU GE Area F for NAS 1 and 21. Chair Thomas further states that he has already spoken with Academic Senate and, as a result, CR is looking at all potential options but currently looking into expanding our Native American Studies Department, which is exciting and would not have happened without the new Area F requirement. Chair Thomas adds that Justine Shaw pointed out that SOC 5 and HIST 22 and 23 may also be suitable courses for Area F articulation. However, the issue is that CSU prefers the courses to be ethnic studies and coded as such with TOP and CIP. Currently, we have very little to offer in terms of objectives and outcomes that match Area F requirements.



Chris Lancaster states that, at the MDC, this topic was tabled because they have utilized their past three meetings working on a request from the President to diversify faculty. Jonothan Pace asks if this would add units to the existing CSU degree requirements or if another area would have less required units. Jennifer Bailey answers that no additional units would be required. Jennifer Burlison adds that three units will come from Area D. Currently, nine units are required for Area D and two of those required courses are history. So consequently, students will not have a third course as an option to pick from social science. Chair Thomas states that the new requirements mean that students will take US history, government and now ethnicity. Burlison comments that it is unfortunate that students do not have an option to take a course from social sciences such as sociology or psychology. Chair Thomas concurs that courses such as sociology are ones in which typically deal with systems of oppression, race, ethnicity and incorporate social justice. Specifically, our Sociology Department is very clear about that message. Chair Thomas notes that his perception is that the CSU system is creating an intervention in order to compel students to be exposed to anti-racism and provide them with an opportunity to use a personal narrative. Moreover, this is a part of a multi-pronged attempt to eliminate equity gaps in achievement despite previous work to eliminate or bridge that gap. It appears as if legislation is moving toward a politically specific direction.

Chair Thomas asserts that, as a result of being a part of the CCC system – an open access institution, we can all agree that by default everyone is completing social justice work. Chair Thomas states that it is important to have an open conversation about the pros and cons of this initiative. Chair Thomas provides a brief history noting that ethnic studies was created as a discipline at the CSU system as a part of the Civil Rights Movement initiated around the 1960's or 1970's. The Committee should have an honest and robust discussion about this topic even if there is disagreement. Chair Thomas clarifies that he has spoken a lot about this topic but his words do not carry more weight than anyone else's voice. In fact, other Committee member voices are more important. Chair Thomas asks the Committee for their thoughts and concludes by stating his bewilderment at the thought of addressing a new GE requirement, competency based education and all of the other various system-wide changes.

Jennifer Bailey notes that, for the articulation officer, timing is very important. In terms of submitting CSU GE requirements, that will occur in December of this year. Chair Thomas adds that the Vice President of Instruction forwarded an email to him from the CIO, CO and ASCCC and they are confused about the timing of this so it is unlikely we will be required to make changes this semester. However, we should be ready to submit and NAS courses are ideal for articulation especially if we can change the TOP and CIP codes to match ethnic studies. Chair Thomas states that is prepared to recommend and support the Committee's recommendation that the 4020 process is used to expand NAS.

Jonothan Pace questions if the new Area F guidelines, or which part of the core competencies document that was posted on this BoardDocs agenda, would fit in our COR and where would faculty be able to find the



requirements? Chair Thomas states that this is a great question but we do not yet have an answer. Chair Thomas notes that, if faculty wish to develop courses appropriate for this area, they could look to C-ID descriptors to look for the best model that would qualify for CSU lower-division courses that would emulate ethnic studies as there currently is not transfer model curriculum for ethnic studies. Jennifer Bailey comments that, each year, guiding notes for CSU GE are updated and they are likely to include this new area.

Chair Thomas concludes the discussion and notes that we are currently operating within a vacuum. However, the Ethnic Studies Department and departmental faculty carry a lot of influence so it's likely that the requirement will be tailored to the current CSU definition. As of now, the only document CR can look to is the FAQ. Finally, Chair Thomas states that Justine Shaw informed him that the MDC is prepared to assist the Curriculum Committee with work toward this new requirement as the MDC Committee has a robust understanding of diversity.

6.3 Cultural Competency: Sean Thomas

Chair Thomas begins the discussion by informing the Committee that the cultural competency resources posted to this agenda on BoardDocs were sent to him from Cameron Papp. Additionally, Cameron Papp produced a summary about cultural competency within curriculum to assist the Committee in completing this work. Chair Thomas thanks Cameron Papp for taking the initiative on this work and informs the Committee that she has an equal voice within the Committee and is permitted to contribute to discussions. Chair Thomas invites Cameron Papp to discuss the work that she has completed regarding cultural competency within curriculum.

Cameron Papp provides a summary about her process of exploring cultural competency research, her findings and the summary document that she wrote and posted to the agenda on BoardDocs.

Chair Thomas continues the discussion by informing the Committee that our role is to make curriculum recommendations to the Academic Senate as our Committee is charged, via Senate Bylaws, with the task of advising faculty about curriculum matters that we implement institutionally. Chair Thomas asserts that the Committee effectively acts upon the goal that the President articulated. The Committee's goal is to institutionalize a response so that the goal solidifies. The Curriculum Committee can utilize its institutional leverage in this manner as this topic is important for the CCC system overall. Cultural competency does not specifically address the student success goals that the Chancellor's Office has enumerated however; it does address some of them indirectly. This topic is being explored through the Curriculum Committee because that is the first stage in the process. At the previous meeting, we discussed adding a resource page for faculty and we can immediately add this to the Curriculum Handbook webpage. It is a requirement for this topic to occur at a future meeting but, at the present, Chair Thomas wishes to open the floor up to Committee members to see their thoughts about the Committee's next steps. There are no comments from Committee members.



Chair Thomas asks the Committee if they are in agreeance with compiling resources and publishing them on the webpage. Alternatively, the Committee could mirror the Long Beach Community College's method or a method similar to what Chris Lancaster discussed at the previous meeting. Chair Thomas states that it is his inclination to continue to compile resources. Chris Lancaster agrees that curating resources is a good place to start and adds that creating a rubric for faculty reference when looking at their curriculum. Jonothan Pace agrees that a resource page could be useful to give faculty an idea of what they are attempting to accomplish, to provide them with the perspective of its importance and why the President is asking us to address cultural competency within curriculum. Lancaster adds that he also agrees with the idea of creating a rubric and incorporating appropriate resources, that faculty may be able to incorporate within their classes.

Chair Thomas states that he can make a recommendation to the Academic Senate to create a task force. Jennifer Burlison states that, as we are discussing this tangibly, she feels a greater ability to understand the topic and appreciates the work that Cameron Papp has initiated. Jennifer Burlison concludes her discussion by noting that she has not had an opportunity to read the documents that Cameron Papp has published, but she feels a greater sense of direction with resources available. Chair Thomas informs the Committee that, regardless of what our recommendation is, it is imperative that our recommendation is suitable and strong. CR has lived a difficult history in several ways with regard to multicultural diversity and our institution has not had strong support from faculty with this topic. For example, GE Area E was not well thought through when it was enacted so many courses were submitted for that area that were not necessarily appropriate. Therefore, it is best if the Committee takes its time in creating a specific and suitable recommendation that is coherent and faculty friendly. Areas exist within the delivery and construction of our courses that would benefit from professional development regarding cultural competency, which is a delicate claim to assert and initiate. Chair Thomas adds that re-reviewing the current materials that Cameron Papp has compiled and including additional resources for the Committee to review at one more meeting, at least, prior to make a recommendation to the Academic Senate is most preferable.

Chair Thomas concludes the discussion by informing Committee member that they should feel free to express concerns, resistance or questions to Chair Thomas that they may not feel comfortable discussing during the public meeting to be able to foster substantial dialogue. Chair Thomas wishes for the Committee to have unanimity and mutual respect regarding this topic and he does not want it moved further along in the process if only a few individuals are accepting of the topic.

7.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS AND OPEN FORUM

7.1 General Announcements and Open Forum

Jonothan Pace notes that, during the program review process within the Math Department, low passing and success rates were discovered. Pace states the Math Department hypothesized this may be related to the fact that it takes a greater time commitment from faculty to teach a class online than it does face-to-face. The Math



Department is interested in lowering the maximum class size for the online modality however, currently, there is not a section within the COR to address this.

Chair Thomas notes that some colleges do offer a differential class size and CR could establish a lower class size for the distance education (DE) modality than face-to-face sections. However, CR does not have a Distance Education Committee at the Academic Senate to recommend this. Chair Thomas states that Wendy Riggs has recommended for the DE Committee to exist and it is possible for the Curriculum Committee to ask for this from the Academic Senate. Jonathan Pace asks if it would be helpful for the Math Department to include this in their program review so that the institution is aware that departments other than the subcommittee are interested in seeing this to fruition. Chair Thomas states that he has a list of requirements for the new DE Committee to address, including differential course size, defining in-person with hybrid as virtually synchronous rather than physical presence, however there is not a specific process in practice.

Chair Thomas closes this discussion by thanking Cameron Papp for compiling resources on cultural competency and adds that he does not know how she found the time to complete this task but is aware that cares deeply about this topic. Chair Thomas continues and informs the Committee that Cameron Papp is responsible for completing digitally tasks with regard to eLumen and the catalog. Chair Thomas adds that Jennifer Bailey has completed fantastic work in communicating C-ID and articulation requirements and specifics with faculty. Chair Thomas then informs the Committee that he will work more quickly to provide them with the DE Addenda & COR revisions to review for future meetings. Chair Thomas states that it is his absolute pleasure to work with everyone, as there is a great sense of satisfaction and fun that encompasses his work with everyone. Chair Thomas again informs Committee members that they are free to communicate with him about anything regarding the cultural competency topic and he is open to their discussion.

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

It is motioned and seconded (Jennifer Burlison / Chris Lancaster) to adjourn the meeting. Chair Sean Thomas adjourns the meeting at 3:05 p.m.

Public Notice of Nondiscrimination: College of the Redwoods does not discriminate on the basis of ethnicity, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, color or disability in any of its programs or activities. College of the Redwoods is committed to providing reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities. Upon request, this publication is available in alternate formats. Please contact Cameron Papp at Cameron-papp@redwoods.edu.