**Present**: *Louie Giambattista, Chair*; Dennis Gravert, Natalie Hannum, Susie Hansen, Marie Karp, A’kilah Moore, Christine Park, Ryan Pedersen, Matthew Stricker, Eileen Valenzuela, Grace Villegas, Penny Wilkins; Nancy Ybarra, Kim Wentworth, Yongmin Zhu, Shondra West (Note taker)

**Absent**: Anthony Hailey

**Guests**: Clayton Smith

Meeting called to order: 1:08 pm; Location: CO-420

**CURRENT ITEMS**

1. **Announcements & Public Comment:**

None

1. **Approval of the Agenda**

**Action:** Approved (M/S: Zhu/Wilkins); unanimous

**Approval of the Minutes from January 21, 2015**

**Action:** Approved with correction (M/S: Park/Stricker); two abstentions: Karp and Wentworth

**Correction**: Item 10 section 8 the statement was corrected “moved Art-015 and 25 from elective” instead of “moved Art-015 and 25 from required to elective”.

1. **Existing Course Outlines of Record**

**Action:** Tabled

**First Reading:**

COUNS-030 – course is being revised as degree applicable along with adding more rigor. The CSLOs were changed to fit 3SP Ed. Plan initiative plus added more outside assignments. The grading option was marked as both; student choice and LR. The department needs to select only one option. Student choice give students the option between P/NP or LR.

It was questioned should the unit amount change if the COOR requires more assignments? Units are based on the number of hours needed to complete the course; the lecture hours were not increased just assignments. The state doesn’t recognize outside work (assignments) as justification for unit increase.

Page 7 - a few learning communities were omitted; UMOJA, MESA, Puente. Check with the originator if the omitted programs should be added.

Page 6 - C-level descriptions starting at (3) needs updating to satisfactory completion instead of partial understanding. In order to receive a “C” students should complete all three steps; assessment, orientation, and Ed. Plan. Correct the statement CSLO4 “first three steps” to “the three steps”.

**Committee Recommendation:**

The author needs to address the following concerns:

1. Is partial understanding acceptable C-level work
2. Add other support programs; learning communities
3. Select type of grading option (SC or LR)
4. **Prerequisites: ENGL-100**

**Action:** Approved with changes; adding “or” (M/S: Gravert/Karp); unanimous

English 926 was converted to 95 and this course is a prerequisite to Engl-100. To distinguish between “and” vs. “or”; list ENGL 95 as “or”, an alternate option to the prerequisite requirement. Prerequisite listed with “or” are referenced on one validation form, listing all the options.

**Committee Recommendation:**

Update the form to include all prerequisite requirements with “or”: ENGL 90 or ENGL 95 or Assessment process.

1. **CTE Requisite Review –** moved item to 7a
2. **Online Supplement – print**

**Action:** Approved (M/S: Gravert/Park); one abstention: Pedersen

The new online supplement form was reviewed by the committee. The form was edited by a taskforce committee. The online supplement previously required two votes from; 1.) Distance Education (DE) and 2.) Curriculum Committee (CC). TV requires that there be a separate vote by CC, so the newest form requires Department Chair signature and vetted to CC for approval. DE will shift their focus to strategic planning regarding appropriate courses to offer online and different types of online curriculum training. This process is being streamlined so there’s one less stop of approval with DE to CC.

It was shared that TV states this process is approved via District procedures. Currently the process is different among the three colleges; CCC, DVC, and LMC. This new process is similar to DVC’s practice. The need for a new form is to distinguish regular and substantive contact hours between the instructor and students that are not taught face-to-face.

Looking at other colleges online forms, they duplicated the COOR instead of using a supplement form. The supplement is not meant to be a stand-alone document it’s part of the COOR.

It was suggested to fill out the form using an existing course so that CC could become familiar with the newest document; provide a sample. With CC being the only body approving the form, it is easier to use the sample to determine required and/or missing fields. When the form was approved by both body bodies; DE and CC it was an extra check and balance.

It was shared the questions from the previous online supplement form were consolidated and items organized by CSLOs to explain what technology method is used; email, discussion board, internet. The CSLOs will be removed and auto filled via CurricuNet process once the instructional methods are included.

It was questioned, departments that do not offer online/hybrid classes should they determine what online courses to offer? With the current practices DE does not have the ability to determine what courses departments should offer online, nor does the form. DE will come up with a list of ways how to teach online courses; CSUEB offers a course on the subject, or check with Courtney, or take Webinar; however it is the department responsibility for developing online courses and finding suitable candidates to teach the course. The online curriculum must hold to what’s stated in the original COOR. The strategy is determining which course are suitable to be offered online; serving students best. DE is an advisory to departments on what types of courses are suitable online.

The CSLOs instructional method was questioned whether it would autofill in CurricuNet once the COOR is updated? The instructional check boxes are going to be removed and replaced with a new category; CSLOs. Instructional method would consist of types of lecture method used; videos or discussion board.

The forms doesn’t validated substantive work instead validate the methods used in replace face-to-face time. It’s the department responsibility to determine the substantive interactions. As the process change via CurriuNet the form will be updated.

A concern about CC being the only body approving online supplement COORs was discussed. It was shared that departments are the first approving body and CC being the official vote of approval. Department chairs are the trusting bodies that are determining suitable online courses and they are responsible if online courses are not productive.

A concern regarding the old and new form; the new form does not have a section explaining how students complete online assignments to receive grades. In addition, the form does not have the teaching criteria to meet GE, whereas the old form did. The new form is a supplement to the original COOR; the COOR lists the grade and GE requirements.

1. **Title V Requirements**

TV COOR document was reviewed by the committee explaining CTE requisites are to be reviewed every two years and non CTE every six years. TV leaves it up to the institution to determine the process. It was suggested that CTE courses be evaluated all at one time putting the responsibility on the department. Requisites and advisories need review every two years because the industry changes. The concern is completing the volume of courses all at once. For best practices, create a form used after program review process (spring) for departments to certify requisites and advisories were reviewed.

At the previous CC meeting it was agreed to develop a process that coincides with the draft process. The PACA Handbook states that during the program review process a curriculum process is periodically reviewed; not stating how. It was brought to the committee’s attention CID courses should be reviewed every five years.

* 1. **CTE Requisite Review**

Create a form for departments certifying they reviewed requisites

* The volume of changes was a concern and it was shared; if changes consists of removing prerequisites, it requires minor change form and added as a consent agenda item for CC approval. If the change consists of adding prerequisite(s), it would require intensive CC review and approval.

It was decided that a form will be created tied with the catalog draft process.

 **STANDING ITEMS**

1. **CurricUNET –** Cohorts1 and 2 COORs were formatted; about 112 hard copies were sent to department chairs for review. E-copies are available upon request. The deadline to return the documents is mid-Feb.
2. **Shared Governance Committee –** none
3. **Articulation -** none
4. **Teaching & Learning Committee** – none
5. **Academic Senate –** Review the Box 2A process and how to handle expectations. This is a District process and it’s unclear if a change to the process is done individually by campus or district-wide.
6. **Other**

Meeting adjourned – 2:24pm

Spring’15 Meeting Dates: February 18; March 4, 18; April 15; May 6

Location and Time: CO-420 / 1-3pm