

Present: *Louie Giambattista, Chair*; Christina Goff, Paula Gunder, Rikki Hall, Morgan Lynn, Aprill Nogarr, Tue Rust, Tess Shideler, Debra Winkler, Nikki Moultrie, Ryan Pedersen, Trinidad Zavala, Eileen Valenzuela, and Grace Villegas, and Shondra West (Note taker)

Absent: Marci Lapriore, Nancy Ybarra,

Guest: Michael Kean (PTEC), Josh Bearden, Academic Senate President, and POLSC Student

Meeting called to order: 2:36pm Location: CO-420

CURRENT ITEMS

1. **Announcements & Public Comment:**

Josh shared a reminder to complete the GE survey that was sent via email to all faculty at LMC.

2. **Approval of the Agenda**

Action: Approved with changes (M/S: Gunder/Rust.); unanimous

- Remove COMSC 40 online supplements from the agenda
- Table 12/4 minutes

Approval of the Minutes:

Action: Approved with changes (M/S: Rust/Winkler); 1 abstention – Lynn

- Correct the spelling of Rikki, Winkler, Aprill Nogarr's names

3. **Consent Agenda**

None

4. **New Courses**

None

5. **Substantive Changes to Existing Course**

None

6. **Online Supplement**

PTEC 25

Action: Approved (M/S: Lynn/Rust); unanimous

PTEC-035

Action: Approved (M/S: Lynn/Rust); unanimous

7. **Programs**

None

8. **Credit Hour Discussion**

Louie shared with the committee documentation of Title V definition of a credit hour and district policy. The intent of sharing the documentation, Louie asked the committee what are

the next steps with changing the board policy procedure to include the latest TV information, more so section F. With regards to meeting the TV requirement, the curriculum committee sign-off yearly that they have met section A-F of the requirement. In addition, Louie shared plans are underway to work with the Academic Senate (AS) and District Governance Council (DGC) to implement a plan and process to modify board policy regarding credit hour. More importantly, Louie shared the concerns with the credit hour applied to all courses, in/out of class instruction, in which the Carnegie unit ratios may differ dependent on the unit value of the class. Also, the policy does not address how to implement the credit hour requirement for physical education, independent study, labs, etc. Activity courses will be difficult to implement the credit hour requirement. Currently, the decision on credit hour and Carnegie units has been a departmental decision, in which a course units total 3.6, the department decides to reduce the course as low as 3.0 units. The primary reason for the department making the decisions, due to a District-wide policy being unavailable. One strategy is to create a local policy to include how departments will address section (f). In the end, Louie shared with the committee if they should wait for the District or State to enforce the changes to the existing policy, and maintain the current practice. It was asked that when a decision is made to provide clarification with regards to the Program and Course Approval Handbook guidelines. Louie shared, the PCAH indicates the unit value for courses can be rounded down but not up, in increments of .1. The debatable issue is consistency with unit value across the district, such that a fraction of a unit must meet the minimum unit value of 0.3. Louie shared, a District policy is needed to specify credit hours minimum and maximum units, and formula ratios for in/out of class hour. Currently, LMC is following the state requirements, then the concern becomes instituting the practice in to be written in the District Policy.

9. Discussion of Workflow for eLumen

Josh shared that the curriculum summit was well received, the information provided was insightful, but there was limited time to work on the eLumen workflow. However, Josh informed Eric about sharing how to develop a tech review committee for curriculum and what that looks like. Eric provided a presentation of what three different tech review committees and processes would compose of. The question, how should one decide to create a tech review and the members that should join the tech review committee. Nikki shared Eric's PowerPoint presentation with the committee via email.

Nikki provided an eLumen course outline (COOR) demonstration regarding how faculty will navigate the system using the curriculum workflow. Nikki further demonstrated how the eLumen workflow aligns with the COOR/curriculum process; cohorts, attachments (pre/co-requisite forms, basic skills, grading, CB codes, hours, units, course content, etc. Using eLumen will help with accessing, updating, and creating COOR documents. Louie asked if the system will support the different workflows based on the approval processes that may or may not need board approval. Further, Nikki shared the task assigned to departments to provide assessment information needed for eLumen.

After Nikki's presentation the committee reviewed the three tech review models that Eric suggested:

1. Individual model consisting of a faculty member

2. Sub-committee consisting of the curriculum chair, faculty members, admissions & records specialist, scheduling specialist, articulation officer
3. Consists of majority faculty members without the curriculum specialist, articulation officer, and admissions & records specialist.

The committee spoke about the different options:

- Option one – least favorable having an individual oversee the process, in which reassign time is needed to support the position. However, it does not exhaust the curriculum committee time to review things outside of pedagogy and pre/co-requisite requirements.
- Option two was favorable, in which the make-up of the committee is diverse expertise. Nikki will outline option number 2 to provide a glimpse of the structure format, which will be provided at the next meeting.
- Option three was least favorable such as having two groups involved in the curriculum process, whereas a separate group of people is needed for the curriculum committee that are not part of the tech review.

Overall, the committee would like to delineate the duties between the tech review and curriculum committee (CC), such as CC would oversee reviewing content. One idea, consider having someone from the GE committee participate in the tech review, in which the GE committee is making recommendations to the CC for the general education appropriateness. There was a concern was addressed about having the CC chair as part of the tech committee, in which the chair's responsibility is to oversee the integrity of the COOR tech review process as a voting member; whereas, the tech review members are not voting members. The Tech review responsibilities would consist of grammar, compliance (State and ACCJC), SLO requirements, etc. without content review. More importantly, having the chairs of GE, TLC, and DE participate in the curriculum committee will help streamline the process, in which they can oversee the components of the COOR that require their expertise.

Nikki reminded the committee to consider teaching faculty Fall schedule when considering who will sit on the tech review committee. The committee will discuss more options at the next meeting with regards to outlining the workflow for option two, also to include the logistics and responsibilities required of that committee. A concern with regards to the impact on people's schedules based on their impacted responsibilities with other commitments.

Adjourned 4:28 pm

Next Meeting Dates:

Spring 2020 – March 18, April 15, May 6