

Present: Christina Goff (Chairperson Designee), Thalia Bobadilla, Sepideh Daroogheha, Dennis Franco, Scott Hubbard, Syed Hussain, George Olgin, Randi Osburn, Camille Santana, Tess Shideler, Girlie Sison, Star Steers, Penny Wilkins, Von Wolf, Rachel Anicetti, Adrianna Simone, Rikki Hall, Ryan Pedersen, Eileen Valenzuela, Grace Villegas and Shondra West (Note taker)

Absent: Natalie Hannum, Aprill Nogarr, and Morgan Lynn

Guest: None

Meeting called to order: 2:35 pm Location: Zoom Meeting
CURRENT ITEMS

1. Announcements & Public Comment:

C. Goff announced she would run the meeting in Morgan’s absence.

2. Approval of the Agenda

Action: approval of the agenda with changes (M/S: T. Shideler/S. Hussain); unanimous

- Remove KNACT 004C, 008A, and 008B courses from the agenda

Approval of the Minutes: December 1, 2021

Action: Approved with changes (M/S: C. Santana/P. Wilkins); abstain T. Shideler

- Remove Tess Shideler from present to absent
- Pg. 3 fix G. Sison initials

3. Standing Item: Articulation Update – no update

4. Consent Agenda

Action: Approved (M/S: P. Wilkins/S. Daroogheha); unanimous

5. New Course Outline – None

6. Existing Course Outlines

KINES-200	The committee questioned whether the course is GE. If so, the GE mapping is needed. Action: Tabled
KNACT-004A	Action: Approved (M/S: P. Wilkins/S. Hussain); unanimous
KNACT-010B	The committee questioned whether the course has a prerequisite form attached, which the conversation concluded with the COOR indicates advisory. Action: Approved (M/S: P. Wilkins/C. Santana); unanimous
KNACT-011A	Action: Approved (M/S: T. Shideler/S. Daroogheha); unanimous
KNACT-020	The committee questioned the title for it being a possible trademark infraction. Action: Tabled
KNACT-057A	Action: Approved (M/S: P. Wilkins/S. Steers); unanimous
KNACT-057B	Action: Approved (M/S: P. Wilkins/G. Sison); unanimous
KNACT-057C	Action: Approved (M/S: T. Shideler/G. Sison); unanimous
KNDAN-053	Action: Approved (M/S: T. Shideler/P. Wilkins); unanimous

KNDAN-054	Action: Approved (M/S: P. Wilkins/T. Shideler); unanimous
KNDAN-055	Action: Approved (M/S: T. Shideler/P. Wilkins); unanimous
MATH-140S	Action: Approved with changes (add the updated textbook information) (M/S: P. Wilkins/S. Daroogheha); abstain S. Hussain The committee discussed the unit differences, in which the hours were adjusted for compliance reasons by converting some of the lecture hours in lab, thus changing the unit values for both lecture and
Co-Requisite MATH-140	Action: Approved (M/S: S. Daroogheha/G. Sison); abstain S. Hussain

7. Employee Engagement Survey

The committee reviewed the survey section that applied to curriculum more so to discuss the results and analyzed the data trends, which brought about concerns and follow-up recommendations for action. Questions 24, 25, and 26 are about the curriculum process, and questions 27, 28, 29 apply to assessment that is not part of the curriculum process but is part of teaching and learning. The committee was presented with a series of review questions to help with the process. The following topics were discussed amongst the group:

- All questions: n/a and don't response is combined into one; uncouple the response.
- Question 24: strongly agree/agree percentages are high. However, a question was asked about what's the intent of evaluating the differences meaning you have the training or you don't. Some members do feel that adequate training is available.

Question 24:

- 20% of the respondents skipped the question which was alarming. What does this mean The survey was sent to all LMC employees, whereas the classified responses might fall into the n/a, don't know, or skip the question altogether.
- committee addressed what they would do with the information, whereas looking at the data to address the n/a, disagree agree, and no responses.
 - One suggestion was to reach out to the faculty to gather more insight about whether assistance is needed to help understand the curriculum process.
 - Determine the best method (department chair/email) to identify the faculty that need help and provide them insight into locating and accessing curriculum resources.
 - Determine the survey relevancy of taking it, and should the question not apply to the person because the individuals don't partake in developing curriculum.
 - Determine the frequency in which the person completes COOR updates; it might be a different experience if the process isn't completed regularly, by semester vs. yearly updates.
- Having connections with departments can support faculty in the process. A. Simone shared her experience in which the Department Chair was helpful with providing guidance on the curriculum process, being that A. Simone was new to the college.
- Idea to tease out the question to ask more specific items:
 - Are you responsible for completing COORs?
 - Do you know how to access them?
 - Is the process is effective?

Question 25 & 26

- Concern that individual may not know the curriculum process overall and where to find the information as it relates to the don't know.
 - Questioning if the committee should look at the data to market the process or market for support? Good suggestion is to work better at branding marketing the curriculum process.
 - Provide details at All College Day. Considering some faculty (PT) are not involved in the process since the (FT) person oversees the process.
 - Offer a Flex as another means of training, which was done in the past by M. Lynn, especially with transitioning to using eLumen.
- The eLumen process provides uncertainty, with some faculty not recognizing the process moved to an electronic environment.
- The committee discussed whether the data provides the curriculum with an opportunity to evaluate the process. There was uncertainty with asking whether participants knew the process vs. agreed with the process.
 - Most people understand course approval but often question the program approval.
 - Create general questions such as:
 - Do you know the curriculum process?
 - Do you know where to find the information to complete a COOR process using the eLumen software?
 - Asking more questions will add value to understanding the needs.

Question 30

- Concern about those that didn't agree with offering DE course offerings and degrees

Survey Comments

The committee reviewed the survey comments more extensively to determine the need to enhance the curriculum process.

- The survey was conducted a year ago and some comments shared are dated since the curriculum has enhanced the process.
 - A comment was shared about the faculty on the curriculum meeting are appreciated.
 - The committee concluded that the comments address how the curriculum committee can work on certain elements to market the process and provide professional development opportunities.
 - With faculty developing reading/writing curriculum to meet specific requirements, one suggestion is develop a cheat sheet to share at department meetings that easy to follow whereas it outlines what's required for curriculum approval.
 - Consider the time of support needed when items are due for departments; timeline is helpful to with messaging when particular items are due.
 - Develop a package that can be easily accessible and understood as it relates to the process.
8. Spring Semester Topics for Discussion: Brainstorm list of topics
C. Goff shared the curriculum task list that was created for Spring 2022. The committee was asked to review the document and share feedback and prioritize actions, to begin with as a focus for spring 2022.

- Clarification was needed regarding the intent of the task statement.
- In eLumen, redesign the online submission process such that it replaces the process of users uploading attached documents. Instead, have data fields similar to all the others in eLumen for faculty to insert text, which will help make the workflow more efficient for tech reviewers when reviewing the COORs to propose through the screen as opposed to clicking on documents and reviewing them separately. Follow-up needed with eLumen.
- Address II followed by IV to help develop an effective and efficient process. This helps address some of the concerns found in the survey data and contextualize the process.
- The task sheet focuses on addressing practical components vs. what information should be in the COOR when received from the faculty. It was shared working on what information is needed when completing COORs is a priority over the practical process.
- Create specific examples that explain the curriculum process.
- A suggestion about incorporating the Guided Pathway process into the curriculum strategies and approval process. (Add to section II or resources for faculty area).
 - The COOR requires meeting title v requirements, in addition to meeting other requirements outside of it. Therefore, the question becomes how many additional items are being added to the process outside of the title v requirements for incorporating the GP process.
 - Should the GP process be tied to pedagogy requirements? The committee discussed how GP could be infused into pedagogy. S. Hussain shared an example in which to incorporate GP into courses in which it touches upon some aspects for students to satisfy requirements. Questions about GP being represented in the COOR, such as the idea of linking PSLOs to COORs as a methodology. Consider adding this topic as a future agenda item. The suggestion was added to task item II and IV, such that what type of information related to guided pathways and is related enough to the course that individuals are seeing it represented in the course outline of record. "something that we want to be visible to us, but also students so that when the student is looking at the course outline of record is there a clear linking between what they're seeing and how the curriculum is being described and how that ties to their own pathway." (C. Goff, 2022). The conversation concluded with having a future discussion on how to incorporate GP and collect data from other sources (HS) that help the college understand the population of the student preparedness for community college. Data analysis was added to section number IV.
- C. Goff highlighted section II items A-E as the prioritizing efforts. The committee concluded that section II is a place to start.
- A suggestion shared about developing instructional/evaluation standards across disciplines was added to section II.

Governance Committees – No updates

- | | |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Shared Governance | 3. Teaching and Learning Committee |
| 2. Articulation | 4. Academic Senate |

Adjourned at: 4:15 pm